

of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969 as "Captive Nations Week."

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of

communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive na-

tions by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 19 at 12:00 P.M.

Dated this 26th day of June, A.D., 1969.
RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 21, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork.—Psalm 19: 1.

Eternal God, our Father, as we come to Thee in prayer may Thy spirit expand our hearts with the life of Thy love, our minds with the wonder of Thy wisdom and our spirits with the security of Thy strength.

On this glorious day when our astronauts have landed on the moon and walked on its surface the heart of our Nation rejoices and together we are filled with joy at the achievements of man in cooperation with Thee.

Grant that we may wisely interpret the meaning of this event and be given insight into Thy great and gracious purpose for all mankind.

While we look at the moon and are moved by the magnificence of this mission may we also look at the miseries of men on this planet and seek to master them that all may live with dignity, respect, and good will. Thus may every heart rejoice at what man can do when he walks with Thee.

In the spirit of Him who went about doing good, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 17, 1969, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:10 p.m., on Friday, July 18, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President on population.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk.

POPULATION GROWTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-139)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1830 there were one billion people on the planet earth. By 1930 there were two billion, and by 1960 there were three billion. Today the world population is three and one-half billion persons.

These statistics illustrate the dramatically increasing rate of population growth. It took many thousands of years to produce the first billion people; the next billion took a century; the third came after thirty years; the fourth will be produced in just fifteen.

If this rate of population growth continues, it is likely that the earth will contain over seven billion human beings by the end of this century. Over the next thirty years, in other words, the world's population could double. And at the end of that time, each new addition of one billion persons would not come over the millennia nor over a century nor even over a decade. If present trends were to continue until the year 2000, the eighth billion would be added in only five years and each additional billion in an even shorter period.

While there are a variety of opinions as to precisely how fast population will grow in the coming decades, most informed observers have a similar response to all such projections. They agree that population growth is among the most important issues we face. They agree that it can be met only if there is a great deal of advance planning. And they agree that the time for such planning is growing very short. It is for all these reasons that I address myself to the population problem in this message, first to its international dimensions and then to its domestic implications.

IN THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

It is in the developing nations of the world that population is growing most rapidly today. In these areas we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. With their birth rates remaining high and with death rates dropping sharply, many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa now grow ten times as fast as they did a century ago. At present rates, many will double and some may even triple their present populations before the year 2000. This fact is in large measure a consequence of rising health standards and economic progress throughout the world, improvements which allow more people to live longer and more of their children to survive to maturity.

As a result, many already impoverished nations are struggling under a handicap of intense population increase which the industrialized nations never had to bear. Even though most of these countries have made rapid progress in total economic

growth—faster in percentage terms than many of the more industrialized nations—their far greater rates of population growth have made development in per capita terms very slow. Their standards of living are not rising quickly, and the gap between life in the rich nations and life in the poor nations is not closing.

There are some respects, in fact, in which economic development threatens to fall behind population growth, so that the quality of life actually worsens. For example, despite considerable improvements in agricultural technology and some dramatic increases in grain production, it is still difficult to feed these added people at adequate levels of nutrition. Protein malnutrition is widespread. It is estimated that every day some 10,000 people—most of them children—are dying from diseases of which malnutrition has been at least a partial cause. Moreover, the physical and mental potential of millions of youngsters is not realized because of a lack of proper food. The promise for increased production and better distribution of food is great, but not great enough to counter these bleak realities.

The burden of population growth is also felt in the field of social progress. In many countries, despite increases in the number of schools and teachers, there are more and more children for whom there is no schooling. Despite construction of new homes, more and more families are without adequate shelter. Unemployment and underemployment are increasing and the situation could be aggravated as more young people grow up and seek to enter the work force.

Nor has development yet reached the stage where it brings with it diminished family size. Many parents in developing countries are still victimized by forces such as poverty and ignorance which make it difficult for them to exercise control over the size of their families. In sum, population growth is a world problem which no country can ignore, whether it is moved by the narrowest perception of national self-interest or the widest vision of a common humanity.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

It is our belief that the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international bodies should take the leadership in responding to world population growth. The United States will cooperate fully with their programs. I would note in this connection that I am most impressed by the scope and thrust of the recent report of the Panel of the United Nations Association, chaired by John D. Rockefeller III. The report stresses the need for expanded action and greater

coordination, concerns which should be high on the agenda of the United Nations.

In addition to working with international organizations, the United States can help by supporting efforts which are initiated by other governments. Already we are doing a great deal in this field. For example, we provide assistance to countries which seek our help in reducing high birthrates—provided always that the services we help to make available can be freely accepted or rejected by the individuals who receive them. Through our aid programs, we have worked to improve agricultural production and bolster economic growth in developing nations.

As I pointed out in my recent message on Foreign Aid, we are making important efforts to improve these programs. In fact, I have asked the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to give population and family planning high priority for attention, personnel, research, and funding among our several aid programs. Similarly, I am asking the Secretaries of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Directors of the Peace Corps and the United States Information Agency to give close attention to population matters as they plan their overseas operations. I also call on the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development to investigate ways of adapting and extending our agricultural experience and capabilities to improve food production and distribution in developing countries. In all of these international efforts, our programs should give further recognition to the important resources of private organizations and university research centers. As we increase our population and family planning efforts abroad, we also call upon other nations to enlarge their programs in this area.

Prompt action in all these areas is essential. For high rates of population growth, as the report of the Panel of the United Nations Association puts it, "impair individual rights, jeopardize national goals, and threaten international stability."

IN THE UNITED STATES

For some time population growth has been seen as a problem for developing countries. Only recently has it come to be seen that pressing problems are also posed for advanced industrial countries when their populations increase at the rate that the United States, for example, must now anticipate. Food supplies may be ample in such nations, but social supplies—the capacity to educate youth, to provide privacy and living space, to maintain the processes of open, democratic government—may be grievously strained.

In the United States our rate of population growth is not as great as that of developing nations. In this country, in fact, the growth rate has generally declined since the eighteenth century. The present growth rate of about one percent per year is still significant, however. Moreover, current statistics indi-

cate that the fertility rate may be approaching the end of its recent decline.

Several factors contribute to the yearly increase, including the large number of couples of childbearing age, the typical size of American families, and our increased longevity. We are rapidly reaching the point in this country where a family reunion, which has typically brought together children, parents, and grandparents, will instead gather family members from four generations. This is a development for which we are grateful and of which we can be proud. But we must also recognize that it will mean a far larger population if the number of children born to each set of parents remains the same.

In 1917 the total number of Americans passed 100 million, after three full centuries of steady growth. In 1967—just half a century later—the 200 million mark was passed. If the present rate of growth continues, the third hundred million persons will be added in roughly a thirty-year period. This means that by the year 2000, or shortly thereafter, there will be more than 300 million Americans.

This growth will produce serious challenges for our society. I believe that many of our present social problems may be related to the fact that we have had only fifty years in which to accommodate the second hundred million Americans. In fact, since 1945 alone some 90 million babies have been born in this country. We have thus had to accomplish in a very few decades an adjustment to population growth which was once spread over centuries. And it now appears that we will have to provide for a third hundred million Americans in a period of just 30 years.

The great majority of the next hundred million Americans will be born to families which looked forward to their birth and are prepared to love them and care for them as they grow up. The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will *not* be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately. And adequate planning, in turn, requires that we ask ourselves a number of important questions.

Where, for example, will the next hundred million Americans live? If the patterns of the last few decades hold for the rest of the century, then at least three-quarters of the next hundred million persons will locate in highly urbanized areas. Are our cities prepared for such an influx? The chaotic history of urban growth suggests that they are not and that many of their existing problems will be severely aggravated by a dramatic increase in numbers. Are there ways, then, of readying our cities? Alternatively, can the trend toward greater concentration of population be reversed? Is it a desirable thing, for example, that half of all the counties in the United States actually lost population in the 1950's despite the growing number of inhabitants in the country as a whole? Are there ways of fostering a better distribution of the growing population?

Some have suggested that systems of

satellite cities or completely new towns can accomplish this goal. The National Commission on Urban Growth has recently produced a stimulating report on this matter, one which recommends the creation of 100 new communities averaging 100,000 people each, and 10 new communities averaging at least 1 million persons. But the total number of people who would be accommodated if even this bold plan were implemented is only 20 million—a mere one-fifth of the expected 30-year increase. If we were to accommodate the full 100 million persons in new communities, we would have to build a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. That means constructing a city the size of Tulsa, Dayton, or Jersey City every 30 days for over 30 years. Clearly, the problem is enormous, and we must examine the alternative solutions very carefully.

Other questions also confront us. How, for example, will we house the next hundred million Americans? Already economical and attractive housing is in very short supply. New architectural forms, construction techniques, and financing strategies must be aggressively pioneered if we are to provide the needed dwellings.

What of our natural resources and the quality of our environment? Pure air and water are fundamental to life itself. Parks, recreational facilities, and an attractive countryside are essential to our emotional well-being. Plant and animal and mineral resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered. The ecological system upon which we now depend may seriously deteriorate if our efforts to conserve and enhance the environment do not match the growth of the population.

How will we educate and employ such a large number of people? Will our transportation systems move them about as quickly and economically as necessary? How will we provide adequate health care when our population reaches 300 million? Will our political structures have to be reordered, too, when our society grows to such proportions? Many of our institutions are already under tremendous strain as they try to respond to the demands of 1969. Will they be swamped by a growing flood of people in the next 30 years? How easily can they be replaced or altered?

Finally we must ask: How can we better assist American families so that they will have no more children than they wish to have? In my first message to Congress on domestic affairs, I called for a national commitment to provide a healthful and stimulating environment for all children during their first five years of life. One of the ways in which we can promote that goal is to provide assistance for more parents in effectively planning their families. We know that involuntary childbearing often results in poor physical and emotional health for all members of the family. It is one of the factors which contribute to our distressingly high infant mortality

rate, the unacceptable level of malnutrition, and the disappointing performance of some children in our schools. Unwanted or untimely childbearing is one of several forces which are driving many families into poverty or keeping them in that condition. Its threat helps to produce the dangerous incidence of illegal abortion. And finally, of course, it needlessly adds to the burdens placed on all our resources by increasing population.

None of the questions I have raised here is new. But all of these questions must now be asked and answered with a new sense of urgency. The answers cannot be given by Government alone, nor can Government alone turn the answers into programs and policies. I believe, however, that the Federal Government does have a special responsibility for defining these problems and for stimulating thoughtful responses.

Perhaps the most dangerous element in the present situation is the fact that so few people are examining these questions from the viewpoint of the whole society. Perceptive businessmen project the demand for their products many years into the future by studying population trends. Other private institutions develop sophisticated planning mechanisms which allow them to account for rapidly changing conditions. In the governmental sphere, however, there is virtually no machinery through which we can develop a detailed understanding of demographic changes and bring that understanding to bear on public policy. The Federal Government makes only a minimal effort in this area. The efforts of State and local governments are also inadequate. Most importantly, the planning which does take place at some levels is poorly understood at others and is often based on unexamined assumptions.

In short, the questions I have posed in this message too often go unasked, and when they are asked, they seldom are adequately answered.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

It is for all these reasons that I today propose the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The Congress should give the Commission responsibility for inquiry and recommendations in three specific areas.

First, *the probable course of population growth, internal migration and related demographic developments between now and the year 2000.*

As much as possible, these projections should be made by regions, States, and metropolitan areas. Because there is an element of uncertainty in such projections, various alternative possibilities should be plotted.

It is of special importance to note that, beginning in August of 1970, population data by county will become available from the decennial census, which will have been taken in April of that year. By April 1971, computer summaries of first-count data will be available by census tract and an important range of information on income, occupations, education, household composition, and other vital considerations will also be in hand. The Federal Government can make bet-

ter use of such demographic information than it has done in the past, and State governments and other political subdivisions can also use such data to better advantage. The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be an appropriate instrument for this important initiative.

Second, *the resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population.*

The single greatest failure of foresight—at all levels of government—over the past generation has been in areas connected with expanding population. Government and legislatures have frequently failed to appreciate the demands which continued population growth would impose on the public sector. These demands are myriad: they will range from pre-school classrooms to post-doctoral fellowships; from public works which carry water over thousands of miles to highways which carry people and products from region to region; from vest pocket parks in crowded cities to forest preserves and quiet lakes in the countryside. Perhaps especially, such demands will assert themselves in forms that affect the quality of life. The time is at hand for a serious assessment of such needs.

Third, *ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, state and local government.*

In some respects, population growth affects everything that American government does. Yet only occasionally do our governmental units pay sufficient attention to population growth in their own planning. Only occasionally do they consider the serious implications of demographic trends for their present and future activities.

Yet some of the necessary information is at hand and can be made available to all levels of government. Much of the rest will be obtained by the Commission. For such information to be of greatest use, however, it should also be interpreted and analyzed and its implications should be made more evident. It is particularly in this connection that the work of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be as much educational as investigative. The American public and its governing units are not as alert as they should be to these growing challenges. A responsible but insistent voice of reason and foresight is needed. The Commission can provide that voice in the years immediately before us.

The membership of the Commission should include two members from each house of the Congress, together with knowledgeable men and women who are broadly representative of our society. The majority should be citizens who have demonstrated a capacity to deal with important questions of public policy. The membership should also include specialists in the biological, social, and environmental sciences, in theology and law, in the arts and in engineering. The Commission should be empowered to create advisory panels to consider subdivisions of its broad subject area and to invite experts and leaders from all

parts of the world to join these panels in their deliberations.

The Commission should be provided with an adequate staff and budget, under the supervision of an executive director of exceptional experience and understanding.

In order that the Commission will have time to utilize the initial data which results from the 1970 census, I ask that it be established for a period of two years. An interim report to the President and Congress should be required at the end of the first year.

OTHER GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

I would take this opportunity to mention a number of additional government activities dealing with population growth which need not await the report of the Commission.

First, *increased research is essential.* It is clear, for example, that we need additional research on birth control methods of all types and the sociology of population growth. Utilizing its Center for Population Research, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should take the lead in developing, with other federal agencies, an expanded research effort, one which is carefully related to those of private organizations, university research centers, international organizations, and other countries.

Second, *we need more trained people to work in population and family planning programs, both in this country and abroad.* I am therefore asking the Secretaries of State, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior along with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to participate in a comprehensive survey of our efforts to attract people to such programs and to train them properly. The same group—in consultation with appropriate state, local, and private officials—should develop recommendations for improvements in this area. I am asking the Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs to coordinate this project.

Third, *the effects of population growth on our environment and on the world's food supply call for careful attention and immediate action.* I am therefore asking the Environmental Quality Council to give careful attention to these matters in its deliberations. I am also asking the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare to give the highest priority to research into new techniques and to other proposals that can help safeguard the environment and increase the world's supply of food.

Fourth, *it is clear that the domestic family planning services supported by the Federal Government should be expanded and better integrated.* Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity are now involved in this important work, yet their combined efforts are not adequate to provide information and services to all who want them. In particular, most of an estimated 5 million low-income women of childbearing age in this country do not now have adequate access to family planning assistance, even though their wishes concerning family size are usually the same

as those of parents of higher income groups.

It is my view that no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them. This we have the capacity to do.

Clearly, in no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all individuals to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities.

In order to achieve this national goal, we will have to increase the amount we are spending on population and family planning. But success in this endeavor will not result from higher expenditures alone. Because the life circumstances and family planning wishes of those who receive services vary considerably, an effective program must be more flexible in its design than are many present efforts. In addition, programs should be better coordinated and more effectively administered. Under current legislation, a comprehensive State or local project must assemble a patchwork of funds from many different sources—a time-consuming and confusing process. Moreover, under existing legislation, requests for funds for family planning services must often compete with requests for other deserving health endeavors.

But these problems can be overcome. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—whose Department is responsible for the largest part of our domestic family planning services—has developed plans to reorganize the major family planning service activities of his agency. A separate unit for these services will be established within the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. The Secretary will send to Congress in the near future legislation which will help the Department implement this important program by providing broader and more precise legislative authority and a clearer source of financial support.

The Office of Economic Opportunity can also contribute to progress in this area by strengthening its innovative programs and pilot projects in the delivery of family planning services to the needy. The existing network of O.E.O. supported community groups should also be used more extensively to provide family planning assistance and information. I am asking the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to determine the ways in which his Agency can best structure and extend its programs in order to help achieve our national goal in the coming years.

As they develop their own plans, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity should also determine the most effective means of coordinating all our domestic family planning programs and should include in their deliberations representatives of the

other agencies that share in this important work. It is my intention that such planning should also involve state and local governments and private agencies, for it is clear that the increased activity of the Federal Government in this area must be matched by a sizable increase in effort at other levels. It would be unrealistic for the Federal Government alone to shoulder the entire burden, but this Administration does accept a clear responsibility to provide essential leadership.

FOR THE FUTURE

One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today. If we now begin our work in an appropriate manner, and if we continue to devote a considerable amount of attention and energy to this problem, then mankind will be able to surmount this challenge as it has surmounted so many during the long march of civilization.

When future generations evaluate the record of our time, one of the most important factors in their judgment will be the way in which we responded to population growth. Let us act in such a way that those who come after us—even as they lift their eyes beyond earth's bounds—can do so with pride in the planet on which they live, with gratitude to those who lived on it in the past, and with continuing confidence in its future.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 18, 1969.

The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (MR. ALBERT) to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

POPULATION GROWTH—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

MR. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future cannot begin work too soon.

President Nixon has said what has needed saying by an American Chief Executive for many years, that our planning in relation to population growth has been woefully inadequate, that such planning is vital if we are to improve the quality of life in America, and that family planning service should be made readily available to all women who want it but cannot afford it.

The President's message on population growth is a singular document. It is the first of its kind ever sent to Congress. It is a document which should excite much thought and careful action. The objectives outlined in the President's message deserve the full support of Congress and of the American people.

The President has dramatically set forth the staggering immensity of the problems posed in projections of U.S. and world population growth. He has focused on the key to meeting these problems—planning. He has also called for action. I subscribe fully to the approach he has outlined.

The President said:

Society will not be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately.

I agree, and I therefore urge Congress to implement as soon as possible legislation establishing the President's proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. I would add that President Nixon is correct in observing that the work of this Commission will be as much educational as investigative.

Key portions of the President's message also deal with administrative actions which President Nixon is taking in advance of any report by the proposed Commission.

There is a clear and present need for the President's moves to expand and improve domestic family planning services.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the President's proposal that we establish as a national goal the providing of adequate family planning services within the next 5 years for all American women who want them but cannot afford them.

However, I would also underscore my agreement with the President's pledge that—

In no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon any religious convictions or personal wishes or freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all authorities to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities.

I endorse at this time Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch's plans to reorganize the major family planning service activities of his department into a separate unit. This plan deserves the support of Congress.

MR. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the pictures being transmitted from the Apollo 11 spacecraft have not only given us our closest look at the moon, they have also given us our most distant views of our own planet. We have come to see our planet for what it really is—a tiny lump of earth hanging in a vast universe. We have been confronted with the stark reality that we live on a very limited piece of real estate with limited resources and yet a rapidly expanding population. We are beginning to realize that our planet cannot possibly hold an infinite number of people nor continue to yield unlimited resources.

We are told that the world's population of 3.5 billion people will double by the year 2000 and that our own country will contain another 100 million inhabitants by the turn of the century. We are told that the population crisis stands second only to the risk of nuclear war as the greatest threat to mankind. We have little reason to doubt this analysis. The question is: Will mankind make any effort to save himself from this impending disaster, or will he, by default, eliminate himself from this planet?

President Nixon has sent to Congress a message which addresses itself to this question by pledging a national commitment to a world problem. The administration is to be commended on its foresight and courage in speaking out on this heretofore sensitive issue. It is obvious

that we can no longer skirt this issue or avoid its implications.

The world population problem, as the President has wisely pointed out, should be dealt with primarily by the world community through the United Nations; and the United States should join with other nations in lending its full support and cooperation in these efforts. At the same time, we should continue to maximize our efforts in offering family planning assistance to those nations which request it, through our Agency for International Development.

Although the population crisis in the United States does not manifest itself in the same way as in the third world where hunger and economic development are the most pressing issues, we are feeling the pinch for greater social services such as jobs, housing, and education as our own population expands. The population problem in our urban areas has already reached crisis proportions in terms of transportation, overcrowding, crime, and pollution. Planning for another 100 million people—most of whom will live in urban areas—in the next 30 years, will be a monumental task which will require the highest of priorities.

To meet this challenge the President has called for a new orientation to this growing problem. In referring to the next 100 million Americans, the President said:

The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will not be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately.

The President points out that this will not only involve questions of housing, environment, education, and jobs, but of family planning as well. In his words:

One of the ways we can promote that goal is to provide assistance for more parents in effectively planning their families.

There can be no question about the need to expand services to the poor who request such assistance. We know, for instance, that of 5 million women who would probably use these services, only one in five now do; that in 1966 there were an estimated 450,000 unwanted births in America; that one in five American families report that their last child was unwanted; that the infant and maternal mortality rate and birth-related diseases among the poor is distressingly high; that malnutrition among pregnant low-income women and their infants is a serious problem often causing permanent disabling effects both mentally and physically.

There can be no question that we have a national responsibility to improve the welfare of all Americans by enabling them to better plan for a healthy and prosperous family environment.

This will require a commitment not only on the part of the Federal Government, but on the part of State and local governments as well as private groups and community action agencies. It will require a greater awareness by all Americans as to the full implications of these problems and what they portend for the future of America and the world.

In this regard, the President has called

for a 2-year National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The Commission would be charged with the responsibility of first, plotting future demographic trends in the next 30 years with a view toward proper planning for the expected growth; second, determining what public resources will be available for handling this growth and how they should be allocated; and third, analyzing the expected impact of this population growth on the activities of Federal, State, and local governments.

The President has also called for greater research into birth control methods and the sociology of population growth; more training of people to work on these problems; a closer study of the population problem in terms of the world food supply; and the expansion and coordination of family planning services supported by the Federal Government. On this latter point the President has said:

No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore, that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them. This we have the capacity to do.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to see that these goals are met by considering and acting on the necessary legislative changes and by strengthening the roles of HEW and OEO in these efforts.

This year the Republicans in this body recognized the need to examine population problems more closely. It was decided that a task force on earth resources and population should be created to study these related questions. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) the task force has thus far heard from 20 authorities in the fields of population and environment.

As chairman of the House Republican conference I wish to commend the task force on the fine work it has done to date and for helping to focus the attention of the administration and the American people on these crucial issues. I am confident that the earth resources and population task force will make a substantial contribution to legislative thinking in these areas as well as to administration planning and reorganization. I would expect that this task force will be in the vanguard of efforts to implement the excellent recommendations set forth in the President's population message.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President for his message to Congress proposing a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

I applaud his political courage in creating public awareness and calling for the high-level study that the population problem deserves.

As chairman of the House Republican task force on earth resources and population, I am very much aware of the urgency and need for congressional action in this area. Our task force in the past 16 weeks has heard from over 20 prominent authorities active in the population and environment fields. These concerned

professionals have told us of the need for action similar to that suggested in the President's message.

I am delighted to see that the President's proposals are very close to legislation I have introduced in the 91st Congress. My two major concerns are the need for increased support and better coordination of existing family planning programs, as well as increased research activity, both in population and resource utilization. The President stated:

In order to achieve this national goal, we will have to increase the amount we are spending on population and family planning.

I could not agree more.

The President also called for Secretary Finch and OEO Director Don Rumsfeld to coordinate with the other agencies all domestic family planning programs. I am convinced that this is essential.

We now know that the fantastic rate of population growth we have witnessed these past 20 years continues with no letup in sight. If this growth rate is not checked now—in this next decade—we face a danger that is as defenseless as nuclear war.

The study reports of this Population Commission must bring these facts of life home to every American man and woman. Unless this problem is recognized and made manageable, starvation, pestilence, and war will solve it for us.

As our task force seeks solutions to the problems of resources, environment, and population, it becomes apparent to us that the present rate of our population growth is related to many of our economic and social ills.

The Nation can be proud of the leadership shown by President Nixon in his recognition of the urgency of this problem.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the term "population explosion" is not a mere catch-phrase, but a stark reality which this country has heretofore not fully recognized. President Nixon has now committed this Nation to the goal of checking unsought population growth at home as well as making it a part of our policy to help other nations do the same.

There are growing signs that the world is fast approaching its maximum population level. In Latin America, for example, the population will more than triple its 1965 level by the year 2000, at which time the world population will approximate 7.5 billion persons. This means that merely to maintain the present inadequate standard of living in those countries will require a threefold increase in their gross national products. Under this set of circumstances, where a greater proportion of the available capital must be used for investment simply to maintain a constant per capita GNP, the chances for any increase in real income are extremely remote. Hundreds of facts and comparisons have been carefully assembled with reference to this problem. The inescapable conclusion, in my opinion, is that rapid population growth is the greatest single problem facing the world today.

Many Americans who recognize overpopulation in the lesser developed na-

tions refuse to recognize it as a problem in this country. While it is true that the United States, fortunately, does not face the immediate prospect of mass starvation present in so many of the underdeveloped countries, it is becoming increasingly clear that we could face a serious decline in the quality of life as the claim upon potential resources becomes more and more intense.

For example, colleges and universities had to absorb a 91-percent increase in enrollment between 1960 and 1968. Certainly, much of this increase is due to a growth in enrollment rates, but mainly it reflects an increase in the number of persons within the college age group—an increase which continues to be dramatic. Our national resources, whether they be in the form of colleges or open spaces, are limited and cannot continue to absorb a "population demand" at this rate without there being some effect upon the quality of the resources available to each individual.

There is a tendency on the part of us all to attribute every conceivable problem to a single cause. Recognizing this fact, I think we must nevertheless ask ourselves certain questions regarding the relationship between serious social problems and the staggering increase in human beings. Does rampant population growth help to explain the increasing cost and complexity of the Federal Government, or the inability of State and local governments to finance the multiplicity of demands placed upon them? Is it related to the continued existence of crowded schools and highways, or to the shortage of new homes, in a time of unprecedented construction? Does it have causal significance with regard to the growing contamination of our environment in the form of air and water pollution?

The ultimate solution to all of these problems does not lie wholly with an intelligent approach to the population challenge. However, in our assessment of the most serious national problems which we confront, over-population must loom large.

President Nixon has become the first Chief Executive to address himself to this most urgent situation. This is, in itself, significant. Moreover, his proposals are sound ones which, I believe, will mark the beginning of this country's dedication to solving perhaps the greatest challenge the world has yet faced.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the President's message, just read to the House, on population growth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUR MEN ON THE MOON

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the Record succeeding the remarks I shall make and also that they shall have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at this hour two Americans are preparing to leave the surface of the moon to join a third circling overhead waiting to take all three back to the earth. This historic event is truly a turning point in the history of mankind. Much of the population of the nations of all continents have shared through television and radio in this great experience. This also shows the marked difference between an open society such as ours and a closed society such as the Soviet Union where at the same time both countries have flights to the moon, one manned in the case of our country and open to the view of all of the world and one unmanned as in the case of the Soviet Union.

These dedicated, skilled, and brave Americans went as ambassadors of all men of all races to land for the first time on another world. Distinctions of nationality, and politics, and social system briefly disappeared as we saw these men set foot on the moon's surface after their gripping descent from orbit.

The Members of this body may recall that on July 16, 1958, 11 years ago, the House passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act. The launch of Apollo 11 last week came on the anniversary date. The Space Act, which I introduced as H.R. 12575, was a completely bipartisan effort. In the two Houses, select or special committees were created to consider space legislation. In each case the majority leader chaired the respective committee. President Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, headed the Senate committee. In the House, I was then the majority leader and chaired the House Select Committee on Aeronautics and Space Exploration. Our late friend and colleague, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, my dear and valued friend and then the minority leader, was the ranking Representative of the Republican Party. I want to pay tribute to all the Members who served on that committee with me because I have never served on a committee with a more dedicated group of men. During the public hearings there was never any difference of opinion when penetrating examination of witnesses was made by Members, and in executive session there was never a difference in the vote of the subcommittee on any action. Everything we did in executive session was unanimous.

President Eisenhower sent us a draft administration bill in April of 1958 on which we held extensive hearings, building a detailed record of the problems and potentials of space. We then went through many weeks of committee work to perfect the bill which established both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the present peaceful

policies of the United States on the use of space.

Since July, 11 years ago when the bill was passed, the Members may not know that I had directed the staff of the select committee to prepare a report on "The Next Ten Years in Space." This was written that July, although not released until the following January when the work of the select committee came to an end. This was the first congressional report which disclosed that the United States was capable of landing men on the moon in about 10 years. Our consultants who especially held this view were Dr. Herbert York, Mr. Roy Johnson, and Rear Adm. John Clark of the Department of Defense, Dr. Wernher von Braun of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, and experts of the North American Aviation Corp., and others, and particularly the members and staff of the select committee of which I had the honor at that time to be chairman. They and the select committee were prophetic in their forecast.

For the next few hours, we and our fellow citizens, and our fellow men the world around will have at least one ear tuned to events on the moon and in the space around the moon until Neil Armstrong, the civilian commander, and Colonel Aldrin rejoin Colonel Collins for the trip back to earth. It happens that I have known the wife of Lieutenant Colonel Collins since she was born. She was born in my district to a family who are close and dear friends of mine, and one of the most prominent families not only in Boston but of the State of Massachusetts.

We thank God for the success these brave men and competent engineers and scientists have attained in opening to human experience more of the mysteries and glories of an infinitely varied universe.

Eleven years ago many of the Members joked about those of us holding hearings and drafting the Space Act, as if we were somehow misguided enthusiasts in a new field we could not understand. There has been much to learn, but it is worth noting that when it came time to vote on the space bill the Congress in both Houses passed the legislation without dissent.

The world has shown for a few days that all men of good will can overcome their differences in a commonsense of participation in the exploration of space by fellow men. Let us hope this speaks well for the future.

This time the men happen to be Americans—and how proud we are of them. We congratulate them—flying openly, as we said, and not secretly on a peaceful mission for all mankind. Important discoveries will flow from space exploration. Perhaps foremost will be an awareness of brotherhood, unity, and understanding we share, a voyage through the heavens on the blue and green spaceship Good Earth.

So, speaking for myself and my colleagues, I extend to these three daring, brave Americans our hearty congratulations and our appreciation. The whole world paused, and we Americans particularly paused, because the feat was

being performed as a result of American effort and by outstanding and courageous Americans.

So, as I said earlier, this is a turning point in the history of mankind, and from this mission we hope and pray will come that broad understanding that will cause people everywhere on earth to realize how close we are to each other, rather than how far apart we are from each other.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished Speaker for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all of us to be proud that we are Americans. The momentous feat of landing a man on the moon by Apollo 11 will surely rank in history with the day in 1492 when Columbus landed on this continent, and thus discovered a New World.

It overwhelms the imagination that now in 1969, only 66 years after Orville Wright—an Ohioan, by the way—first put a manmade flying machine in the air and flew 100 feet, three men have traveled a quarter of a million miles to the moon, two of them to walk on the moon and to bring back specimens of moon dust and rock.

I am especially proud of this historic occasion, Mr. Speaker, because Astronaut Neil Armstrong, who is the commander of Apollo 11 and who was the first man from this planet to set foot on the moon, comes from Wapakoneta, Ohio, a city of about 7,000 people in my congressional district, the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. I know his fine parents. I know Neil, and I know his lovely wife.

He was born in 1930, and he was a combat pilot in Korea for the Navy. After his naval service he studied aeronautical engineering at Purdue University under the GI bill. As has been the case, Mr. Speaker, with many motivated young men, after the act of this Congress, the GI bill helped Neil Armstrong start his climb up the ladder of success which took him to the moon.

In observance of this historic role of Neil Armstrong, our Governor has proclaimed July 21 "Neil Armstrong Day."

Neil Armstrong, followed closely by fellow astronaut Edwin Aldrin, stepped onto the lunar surface from the lunar landing craft yesterday evening, July 20, and remained on the moon's surface until this morning, July 21.

Mr. Speaker, on this great voyage, Neil Armstrong represents not just the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio or the State of Ohio, or even the entire United States—but he represents all mankind. Indeed, as Neil Armstrong so dramatically said, during that historic moment when he first set foot on the moon, "That is one small step for man, one giant step for mankind."

So these brave astronauts, Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, have been praised around the world for their magnificent achievement.

Men and women of all faiths, all races, and all countries are today united as one in praying for the safe return to earth of these three brave men.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might point out that during my service in the House of Representatives I have been chairman of two committees, both special or select committees.

In 1934 I was chairman of the committee investigating communism, nazism, facism, and bigotry. The other committee of which I was chairman was this particular select committee on aeronautics and space exploration.

I will say that I am proud of this committee. They made significant contributions. Every member on that committee was dedicated in their service and they made tremendous contributions for our country, as I referred to previously.

We held hearings and went into these problems so deeply and so profoundly that when the House committee reported it to the House, it was passed by the House of Representatives and then it was sent to the Senate. The other body did not find it necessary to hold hearings and they considered in view of the profound depth of the work of the House committee that the Senate did not find it necessary to conduct hearings.

So the Senate adopted our bill with one slight amendment which the House concurred in when the bill came back to the House for its consideration of that amendment.

I am particularly proud of that one committee that I had the privilege to serve on as chairman, and I am very proud of each and every Member who participated there.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker of the House yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, truly "our cup runneth over" with pride on the achievement of our three astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, in the landing on the surface of the moon and its mysteries to reveal. And in our pride we are not unmindful of the thousands who made this possible.

While it was our own brave young men who first walked on the moon, and while it is the American flag that was first placed there, other men of other countries made their contribution. "Our cup runneth over" with thanks to Copernicus and Galileo, and to Von Braun and to many, many others whose discoveries and dreams whose genius made this achievement in our day possible.

As the poet William Cowper wrote:

God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform.

And there came to mind last evening, as I viewed this historic event through the miracle of television, the lines from the Eighth Psalm:

When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?

The question we now hear asked: What does all this mean? It is a question to which only time will give an answer. It was the same question that was asked when man explored the unknowns here on earth: when Magellan

made his trip around the world and when Columbus set sail from Spain.

Who knows what secrets the soil and the rock found on the moon will reveal? Who knows what ingredients they may have that will lead to other achievements in medical science or some other area of human endeavor?

Through the miracle of television we shared this achievement with the entire world. "We came in peace" is written on the plaque our astronauts left on the moon. In peaceful pursuits for the betterment of all mankind we will share not alone this achievement but all that may result from it.

It was as Astronaut Armstrong stated:

One small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.

My congratulations to our three remarkable astronauts. My congratulations to all who contributed to this great event.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join in congratulating the distinguished Speaker and the members of that first space committee who made possible the beginning of a program that culminated last night with the spectacular landing on the moon by these great Americans. As we congratulate the Speaker, we also congratulate American educational institutions, the scientific community, the American industrial complex, the people on NASA and, of course, the brave Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, themselves, who have made all of this possible.

It occurs to me if there is one lesson to be learned from the spectacular achievement last night, it is that the genius of man can reach unlimited heights of achievement when there is total commitment.

This historic achievement was accomplished last night because the scientists, the industrial community, the scholars, and all of those involved, were free to pursue their main goal of reaching the moon and placing a man on the moon, unfettered by obstructions from vested interests, narrow special interests, or the petty jealousies that so often interfere with our other commitments.

The world needed desperately this lesson which we learned last night. We needed to be reminded that man can indeed find a solution to his most vexing problems and ambitions if he has a total commitment. We all ought to remember this indisputable truism proven so dramatically last night as we look at other problems which confront America and the rest of the world today.

It would be my hope that we use our great accomplishment in the Sea of Tranquility last night as an inspiration for the world's future actions.

It would be my hope that President Nixon would invite all of the world leaders—yes, including those who are our enemies—all the world leaders to participate personally here in Washington in an international tribute honoring these three young men when they come back to the United States after they complete their 21-day quarantine. Per-

haps such an international meeting can indeed begin a new "era of tranquillity" for mankind.

Our prayers go out that these men return to the United States safely and upon their return, they and their achievement may serve as an inspiration for mankind to resolve its differences in manners other than mass destruction.

When they left the moon, Armstrong and Aldrin said they were leaving behind an olive branch of peace.

May this beautiful and unselfish gesture be an inspiration to all mankind that the world has embarked on a new era of imaginative creativity to replace the past decades of wanton destruction.

I hope a meeting of the world's leaders would provide the means for new lines of communication toward meaningful and lasting peace. We know from our most recent experience that such informal contacts between world leaders offer many opportunities for meaningful contacts and communications that are too often impossible within the confines of formal diplomatic relations.

Mr. Nixon could become the architect of a new world social order—an "Era of Tranquillity" by inviting these world leaders to join in our tribute to the world's first moon team.

Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins are proud Americans and all Americans are proud of them but such an international assemblage would prove that their historic achievement should be shared by the entire world, particularly since they left on the moon messages of good will from 73 nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the three astronauts, Neil Armstrong, civilian commander, Col. Edwin Aldrin, and Lt. Col. Michael Collins, the top flight Apollo 11 crew, and the 420,000 people in NASA, industry, laboratories, shops, and Congress, that have worked for 9 years to make this signal success possible for our good United States. We American citizens can now say we have won the peaceful race of courage and technology to land the first men on the moon, and are the first nation in space without question.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I know this success of Apollo 11, is worth 100 foreign aid programs of the United States. Apollo 11 is also good for our U.S. security and the safety of the American people, to be able to operate in space, and likewise a giant step forward for our U.S. technical progress and competence.

I would like to tell the Speaker and the House, as a member of the opposition party I feel his contributions and leadership to the development of the U.S. space program have been outstanding and vitally necessary to our present U.S. success.

When the Speaker took the chairmanship of the House Select Committee on Space, it was a field which was not only pioneering, but it had never been done before in Congress. Nobody thought it

was possible we could go into space and to operate as we are doing now. I congratulate the Speaker on his foresight and progressive work for the development of the U.S. program on the peaceful uses of outer space.

That House select committee set up the National Aeronautics and Space Committee, which has been competently managed without politics ever since. As one of the working members on that original select space committee team, I want the Speaker to know what a privilege it has been to me to follow his leadership in space and science matters.

I hope Congress will go ahead on space progress with Apollo 11 as a beginning and not call it a finish to U.S. peaceful space programs. Competition is good in peaceful pursuits, let us have more. We need a moon installation for exploration and astronomy purposes. We need space laboratories to develop the tremendous new fields of space science. We need a shuttle service in space. We likewise need higher-energy liquid and solid propellants for boosters, and to upgrade the Saturn 5, the capsules. We need nuclear fuels for space, and should proceed promptly with the Nerva nuclear rocket which is showing such success so far. My high compliments to Vice President AGNEW, chairman of the U.S. National Space Council, for his recommendation of a manned landing on Mars. This is a fine idea for U.S. progress in space. We can do it. We have the know-how, the installations, communications, and fine crews and personnel—Let us maintain our space leadership for the United States.

We likewise need to develop reusable rockets and boosters. We need reentry vehicles that can bring these capsules back as if they were planes. We can reduce space costs to a fraction of present costs by intelligent planning.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the others here in wishing Apollo 11 crew every success, and again I compliment the Speaker, and express my deep gratitude for being on that first House select space committee, and the opportunity for hard work.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of our great Speaker in complimenting these men who have accomplished more than man has ever done before in the entire history of the whole world.

I think the landing on the moon is a vindication of the vision and the faith of our great Speaker, who is really the father of the Science and Astronautics Committee. There are those of us who remember the lean days when the Speaker could see these things, when they were just blurred in our vision. That is a great tribute to our own Speaker.

I think this is only the beginning.

Were I to have any criticism of this feat, it would be that I have not seen enough credit assigned to the help of Almighty God in getting these men onto the moon. Somebody has overlooked that. I wish to point out that without

His help, the men would not be there. Without the order of the heavens and the order of the firmament and all the celestial bodies, we would not have gained the information to have accomplished this feat. It is with the help of Almighty God and our faith in Him, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker's faith was founded, founded in that same faith in God, which is the reason for this great success. I think it will be with the continuing help of God that they will leave there and return home safely, which I am sure is the wish and prayer also of our great Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker for yielding.

Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins are men of courage and skill whose names will live forever with Columbus and Wright and Lindbergh.

We give them the thanks of a grateful Nation.

This is an incredible feat, made even more unbelievable by our being able to watch every move from a quarter million miles away.

A great day has dawned for the entire world. Landing on the moon is so significant that I doubt we yet realize what has happened for mankind. I prophesy it will be for the good of the entire world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished Speaker and my colleagues in expressing the thanks of a proud humanity to three brave astronauts, Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, and Mike Collins, upon the almost unbelievable success of their momentous and historic mission. As they walked on the moon the whole world watched in wonder. This accomplishment was described most graphically and correctly by Neil Armstrong when he took that "one giant leap for mankind."

May God bring safely back to earth these courageous heroes of the new age which they have heralded. Thank you, thank you, brave hearts and skillful hands, for what you have done for your fellow man.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "the Eagle has landed" has been added to the permanent collection of imperishable expressions that have marked man's march toward progress. Today those of us in the Congress join millions of our countrymen in expressing heartfelt thanks to God, the Creator of our universe for the success that marked the flight of Apollo 11 to this moment. We shall continue to pray for the successful completion of the entire mission. Meanwhile, I wish to express my pride in the accomplishments of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as well as the many other thousands who have assisted them in this triumph of both the human spirit and the marshaled resources of science and technology.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of great significance in the his-

tory of our country and in the history of man.

I join our distinguished Speaker in saluting the brave astronauts who have placed our flag on the moon, and in hailing the thousands of other Americans who have contributed in countless ways to this major scientific achievement.

Many Oklahomans have shared in the work and the industrial production which made today possible, and many Oklahomans will be praying for the safe return on Thursday of the astronauts.

Let us all hope and pray they will soon be reunited in safety with their families, and that their brave conquest of space—and the new frontiers of knowledge and understanding that will follow—will lead to a better day for all people.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, millions of words are being written and spoken in tribute to the magnificent courage and fantastic American technology that have combined to place two American astronauts on the moon in a most historic event.

But the most eloquent of all of these countless words were those spoken by pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong after the lunar module settled into the moon dust.

"The Eagle has landed," he reported.

And later as he stepped from the module to the crinkly surface of the moon, Astronaut Armstrong added:

That's one small step for man—one giant leap for mankind.

This was truly a fantastic feat for the United States of America—and a remarkable achievement for mankind.

The American eagle—the symbol of our great Nation—has soared to the moon and planted his symbol there, the flag of the United States.

The greatness—the excellence—the courage—of our three astronauts is in the tradition of the greatness of America itself. The determination and the ability to overcome all obstacles is reassurance to mankind throughout this planet that he can solve his problems.

Mr. Speaker, as the Nation and the world watched, Astronauts Armstrong and Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, together with Astronaut Mike Collins in the parent ship orbiting the moon, achieved the climactic objective of reaching the moon in the sixties.

An estimated half-billion people throughout the world watched in awe as the astronauts bounced across the moonscape.

Our chests swell and our hearts pound with pride as we reflect on this amazing, fantastic, fabulous feat of man and science.

I join my colleagues and people throughout the world in commending and congratulating our three cool, courageous astronauts—our modern-day pioneer explorers—who took giant steps into the future as they left their footprints in the moon.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, all men of good will are joining in saluting the gallant Americans whose craft still rests on the surface of the moon, as they prepare to set forth on the return portion of man's first voyage to that distant planet. It was my great privilege to represent the people of northwest Iowa

last Wednesday at the launchsite and to wish our astronauts well as Apollo 11 took wing. This morning I watched with my family in Sioux City as the television cameras recorded the culmination of this great mission when man first set foot on the moon.

While we have much unfinished business ahead of us, let us not permit this to detract from this day of supreme achievement, not just for America, but for all mankind, the day when man truly conquered space. This is not the time to cavil and complain about those areas in which our beloved country may still fall short of the mark. This is not the day to raise our voices in behalf of the special interests of individual constituencies. There will be time enough for that when Apollo 11 has returned we pray safely to Mother Earth. This is the time to respond wholeheartedly to President Nixon's call to make this a day of national dedication and participation in man's triumph over space.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, all of us are proud of our great country and the success of Apollo 11. We are proud of the astronauts, proud of the technology, and proud of the fact that it was America that could lead the world to this historic occurrence.

This is by far the most historic event to happen in our lifetime, but we wish God's blessing for these brave men as they continue the flight of Apollo 11.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating today, not a narrow national victory in competition with other nations, but rather a victory of mankind over the limits to his existence.

Centuries from now men will look upon this lunar landing as man's first and most fundamental assertion that the earth will not be his final resting place. "How exciting it must have been," they will say, "to have been alive then."

And they will be right, as any one of the hundreds of millions of those who watched the events of this past week could testify. For with the success of the Apollo program, man has truly "slipped the surly bonds of earth."

One of the most significant contributions of this Nation's space program, often overlooked, is its unique ability to uplift and inspire the spirit and imagination of men. What other event has brought together so many people, at home, and abroad, in awe and pride at the capability of man to master the challenges of his existence? Pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong did that at 10:56 p.m., eastern daylight time, July 20, 1969, when he stepped out onto the moon and said, "That is one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of other challenges which confront us now—those of war, poverty, hunger, and the pollution of our environment. But surely we must be heartened and encouraged by this dramatic demonstration that man can overcome even the most complex of problems in order to achieve the goals which he sets for himself.

While the flag of the United States proudly stands implanted on the moon, let us beware of regarding this magnificent achievement in purely chauvinistic or military terms. If we can be moved

to commit ourselves to solving the complexities of the urban crisis, as we committed ourselves to setting foot on the moon, then there is a great and promising future for man here on earth, as well as in the heavens.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced legislation to create a national holiday, designated as "Lunar Landing Day," to be celebrated on July 20 in 1970, and thereafter on the third Monday of every July.

It will be a day to commemorate and honor the courage of Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins. It will be a day to reflect on the beginnings of man's exploration of outer space just as we celebrate the beginning of the exploration of the New World on Columbus Day. But most important, it will be a day to renew our confidence in man's inherent potential for mastering his own destiny.

That confidence and resolve can ultimately lead us to the successful resolution of the Nation's and the world's problems; and we are indebted to the men and women of the space program for showing us how much we can do, and how far we can go.

"Lunar Landing Day" will honor all of them.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, even now man has become a physical presence on the moon, a celestial body other than his home planet. We have crossed the threshold of space and stand on the brink of infinity as well as a new era in the unfolding story of the race of men. A dream of the ages has been realized.

Throughout recorded history there have been those few men who have dared raise their eyes to distant horizons, conceiving new destinies for all their fellows. Such names are few, their deeds are enshrined, their footsteps huge. Our Nation has been blessed with a rare few of them. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson dreamt the dream. Others have now fulfilled it.

Who among us can ever forget the shock sputnik threw into all of us, as our entire way of life stood challenged? When President Kennedy pledged America to a goal of reaching the moon, he knew what he was doing. History today has vindicated him.

Americans who have reached the moon follow a path trodden by only an elect few. Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Mike Collins follow the footsteps of Magellan, Columbus, Balboa, and every towering pioneer who dares unplumbed depths and vast unknowns in the name of courage, exploration, and advancement of all men. Many aspire to such stature. Few attain it. Even fewer are truly deserving. These who reached the moon will be men among men as long as history is written. No monument can do their accomplishment justice. No words can adequately describe their deeds. Honor is due not only those who made the commitment, those who honored it, and those who made it possible for them to reach their goal, but to so many others. American technology, education, and industry have done all of us proud. Those who built the systems and sent them on their way are due a generous share of the glory.

Let us remember those who perished both Americans and Russians, in pursuit

of this glittering, and now realized vision. They who dare in the name of path-finding are truly due honor and respect.

Mr. Speaker, in times to come, other men shall look back in amazement at our era. It is such a mixture of the sublime and the degraded, the superb and the horrid, the noble and disgusting, the pinnacle and the nadir. Starvation abroad and domestically mixes with heart transplants and wonder drugs. Curing of disease is blended with nerve gas and MIRV. Man is an ultimate mixture himself, the saintly and the demoniacal.

This morning he approached the top-most peak of technological achievement. I pray that in future, other generations will testify to his ability to ascend to equally rarified heights of human understanding and compassion. The beginning of this new age can only be signified by a question mark on the sands of time, at last disturbed by a man's footprints.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, today we, as Americans, share the pride merited by the success of the Apollo 11 mission in making the first footprints of man on the moon those of Americans.

One physicist has estimated that those first footprints will remain stamped on the moon's surface for a million years.

American technology and ingenuity have been proved the most advanced in the world, and our space effort has earned for us a place in history which time can never erase.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for all Alabamians when I express our pride that the Saturn 5 rocket, which powered this and previous Apollo missions through the tenacious grip of the earth's gravity, was developed at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala.

Some 300,000 Alabamians participated in the Apollo project at its peak.

The mighty Saturn rocket, which stands 36 stories tall, can deliver 7½ million pounds of thrust, twice that of the original Redstone rocket that launched the first Mercury manned flights.

Mr. Speaker, Alabamians are proud that the Saturn 5 originated within our State, and even more proud, as Americans, to have been part of the space effort.

And when the glory of this new accomplishment fades with time, we pray that mankind will continue to strive for the same purpose expressed by our three astronauts, Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins, on the plaque placed on the moon's surface yesterday.

The plaque reads, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on this day words are inadequate to express our feelings. Man has for the first time walked on the moon. As our astronauts performed this history-making feat, I am sure that the hopes and prayers of the world were with them. This is a great day for the United States of America but it is also a great day for our friends throughout the world.

We have, indeed, now begun the conquest of space and I am sure all who saw it shared with me the thrill of seeing on televisions Americans walking on

the surface of the moon—the first men there.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD my feelings following the highly successful landing by our U.S. astronauts on the moon and their movements on its surface.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers today are for a safe return of the astronauts to earth and with this utterly fantastic achievement of man landing on the moon, I hope and pray that this technological event will serve as a rallying cry to unite our country and all mankind once again.

The activity on the moon by our astronauts was a terrific demonstration of courage, faith, and dedication, and I am sure all America is proud and the rest of the world, too. I, myself, was so proud to see our heroes plant the U.S. flag on the moon as a sign of the strength of America.

This event further instills in mankind the continued search for even greater achievements, just as in the early growing years of this Nation, that same drive by our forefathers, then, as now, undoubtedly will continue into the future.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today's Day of Participation, honoring our Nation's successful landing on the moon, has my full support and endorsement, and I feel such a day of recognition is fully justified.

It was with considerable pleasure that my appeal on Friday in behalf of our postal field service employees played a role in the decision by Postmaster General William Blount to grant these dedicated public servants full participation in this special day. According to a policy decision by Postmaster General Blount, these employees have been either granted the day off from their duties, or will be granted compensatory pay or time off at a future date.

An inequity occurred to these employees earlier this year when a national day of mourning was declared for our late President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. On that occasion, Federal offices were closed and the majority of our Federal employees were granted leave from their duties. Our postal clerks and other postal field service employees, who also held our late President in great respect, continued at their jobs.

In an effort to avoid concern in the future over whether or not these employees will be treated equally with other Federal workers, I have introduced legislation today which would grant these employees time off, of compensatory pay or compensatory time off in the event a future Executive order creates a national day of mourning, day of participation, or special holiday.

This legislation will, I feel, correct what has been an injustice in the past, and prevent such an injustice from occurring in the future.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on a cloudy, rainy day yesterday and a cloudy, rainy night last night the glow from the moon lit up not only the dreariest night but all of mankind.

As man stood for the first time on another planet there was a compelling need to find perspective in this moment of light in history. Man is technically intelligent enough to visit other planets,

but is he wise enough? In the name of all mankind man went in peace to the moon, but on the planet he calls home four separate wars were being fought. Two men could be heard distinctly across a quarter million miles of space, but on the planet he calls home, billions of voices are unheard in their daily cries for food or for freedom.

Man can accomplish that which man agrees it is essential to do, but man has not agreed that it is essential to live in peace, to control pollution and population, to feed the hungry, to free those ethnically or economically enslaved, or to preserve the resources of the planet called earth.

We must not, and we cannot, abandon the quest for the new and the elsewhere, for it is of man's nature to quest. Let us pray that it is not a necessary part of man's nature to war, to pollute, to enslave, and to destroy, for if it is there may be something pathetic and prophetic in a lonely flag standing for eons on a windless barren plain, seen by no one, surrounded by some incredibly expensive litter—an eternal memorial to an animal smart enough and brave enough to place it there, but so stupid it destroyed the planet from whence it came, and to which it had to return.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a proud day for America. Late last night and early this morning, the whole world witnessed the end of a long, hard journey begun nearly 8 years ago when President Kennedy committed us to a manned landing on the moon. As I watched astronaut Armstrong step onto the surface of the moon, I could not help but feel that all of us were right there with him. This could never have happened had not the majority of Americans supported our space program. It could never have happened had our colleges and universities not trained the thousands of scientists and technicians who designed and built the space vehicles used in this historic flight.

My State of Alabama played an important part in the moon landing. It was at the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville that the giant Saturn V rocket was developed. Hundreds of other industries throughout our State also participated in the program either directly or indirectly. Thousands of Alabama-trained people helped with the various parts of the space program.

I join today with all Alabamians and all Americans in saluting not only the Apollo 11 crew, but every man and woman who has assisted in bringing about this historic moon landing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following articles from the Birmingham Post-Herald and Birmingham News, which describe further the part Alabama played in the space program, printed in the RECORD:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald]
IN APOLLO 11 MISSION: REDSTONE ARSENAL HAS SENSE OF PRIDE
(By Beth Russler)

HUNTSVILLE.—The atmosphere at Redstone Arsenal Wednesday, the day that the Saturn V engines which had their birthplace here lifted three American astronauts toward the moon, was not once of "business as usual."

Neither was it a day of celebration with noisy jubilation in the streets.

The expression of one NASA spokesman who said "we knew it would work," pretty well summed up the general attitude throughout the various agencies represented on the sprawling military compound.

More than 1,050 Arsenal employees made the trip to Cape Kennedy to see the culmination of their efforts when the Apollo 11 was borne aloft by a cluster of the mighty Saturns.

Only 150 of these were on assignment while at least 900 more paid their own way.

Meanwhile back at the Rocket Center in Huntsville, an undetermined number of employees took a few hours of annual leave to stay home and watch the spectacle on television.

Those who arrived at work on time watched the proceedings with single minded attention on closed circuit television in the offices and auditoriums of their own divisions.

Col. Paul Schuppener, commandant of the Army Missile and Munitions Center and School, reminisced over the launchings which have been a part of his career for the past 11 years.

Remembering the morning of Jan. 31, 1958, when he sat in the chief of staff's telecom room in Washington, he and the secretary of the Army, Gen. John B. Medaris, then commanding general of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, and Dr. Wernher von Braun, director of the Marshall Space Flight Center, waited for the word that Explorer I was indeed in orbit and was likely to stay there.

"None of us dreamed that day," Col. Schuppener said, "that in only 11.5 years we would have the capability of putting a man on the moon."

Commenting on Vice President Spiro Agnew's prediction that we will have a manned Mars mission before the end of the century, Col. Schuppener said, "we have made such marvelous progress so far, now anything can happen."

Even though six previous launches have conditioned the people of Huntsville to expect success, there was nevertheless a feeling of pride and tense anticipation caused by the attempt of a new dimension in space travel until it was apparent that Apollo 11 too had performed flawlessly on the first phase of its mission.

Then the old complacency returned, because as the man said, "we knew it would work."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News,
July 16, 1969]

THOUSANDS OF SATURN'S PARENTS CHEER BABY OFF

(By Hoyt Hartwell)

HUNTSVILLE.—The mighty rocket that propelled Apollo 11 toward the moon today was the dependable Saturn V developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Marshall Space Flight Center here. Never has the Saturn failed.

The 41-engine rocket launched two unmanned space vehicles and then the Apollo 8, 9 and 10 crews. And now the biggest of all—the flight that is to put the first man on the moon.

The Saturn's three stages total 281 feet long, making that part of the moon ship taller than a 36-story building. At liftoff, the rocket weighed 6.2 million pounds.

It becomes lighter each second as the powerful engines gulp the six million pounds of fuel. The first stage's five engines, for instance, consume 2,230 gallons per second, providing 7.5 million pounds of thrust.

Engineers and housewives, scientists and dairymen—everyone at Huntsville is as excited as children at Christmas time.

So excited, in fact, that an estimated 10,000 of them were at Cape Kennedy to watch the space ship rise toward the moon today.

They went there in a 250-car caravan on 65 buses, three transport planes and in campers, commercial planes and family cars.

CXV—1270—Part 15

Some took their vacations in order to be in Florida for the historic occasion.

Many homes in Huntsville contained only mother and children today. The men were at Kennedy—some to work, others to watch their Saturn perform.

Dr. Werner von Braun lead a staff of 150 from the Marshall center to the cape to serve as support personnel.

Another 900 Marshall employees, given paid leave, went there at their own expense.

So many Huntsville people were there that a bus shuttle service was set up in Florida to take them to within view of the launch and then return them to the staging points.

Meanwhile, just about all NASA activity here ceased during the launch time as employees huddled around 70 television monitors set up for them.

It was reminiscent of the first orbital flight of a free world satellite on Jan. 31, 1958, when the Redstone rocket, also developed here, was the launch vehicle.

The entire city of Huntsville celebrated that event and similar celebrations are planned here on Thursday of next week when the Apollo 11 astronauts splash down in the Pacific at the end of their mission.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I have never been prouder to be an American. What a difference from the emotional frustration when we learned of sputnik in 1958.

The moon landing of Apollo 11 marks the start of a new era in the history of the world. No longer is man contained by his environment. The success of Apollo 11 is proof that America's greatness does not lie in its material assets, but in its spirit, courage, and determination to conquer the unknown.

This country has been recently torn by internal strife. Apollo 11 truly united this country in purpose and prayers—regardless of race, creed, color or political philosophy. Perhaps the success of the space program, due to the teamwork of individuals possessing various skills and backgrounds, can teach all of us a lesson. A new era of understanding and co-operation, marked by the rebirth of the human spirit, can now begin on the planet earth.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the marvelous scientific accomplishment of the Apollo 11 mission is a singular historic event. I congratulate the Apollo 11 crew, Mike Collins, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Neil Armstrong, and the outstanding backup and support crews and controllers, scientists, engineers, professionals, and countless others who made this possible. It is my hope that the aurora of this magnificent achievement will help light the way toward peaceful understanding and harmony between all of the people on earth.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the distinguished Speaker and my colleagues to pay tribute to the Apollo 11 astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins, and to all who participated in their journey, from the lowliest to the highest, may all share in their glory.

"The Eagle has landed" and "A small step for man; a giant leap for mankind" will forever be a part of recorded history, so shall the words, "We came in peace." I speak for the people of the 15th District of Texas when I say "Well done." May your courage, and the genius that made all this possible bring inspiration to mankind to continue to ex-

plore and conquer the vastness of space, and may your humility and devotion to the duty inspire us to continue our search for solutions to the problems of mankind.

God bless you; "Brave Eagles"—God-speed and a safe return to your loved ones, and to us, because now you belong to history, and this day in history belongs to you.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to join our beloved and distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK), in paying tribute to those who made possible our successful landing on the moon. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of all our astronauts, these gallant, courageous, and dedicated men who have made our country first in space. I commend you, Mr. Speaker, for your foresight as one of the principal architects of this successful program. I commend President Lyndon B. Johnson for his role. Here in the House, I would like to pay tribute to GEORGE MILLER, "TIGER" TEAGUE, and the members of the committee who never faltered or wavered in their belief that America would succeed.

This is the proper time to acknowledge and express our appreciation to the leaders in the House who made this magnificent triumph possible. It is a good time to thank the American people for their support of this program and their belief in the future of our great Nation. I remember the Speaker was one of those leaders in the House during World War II who did not hesitate to provide the means for this Nation to split the atom without any hesitation or question about its future success. The House leaders, when challenged by sputnik, again did not hesitate, and the conquest of space is now a reality.

Our lunar landing yesterday is a peace mission. We are there for the freedom of all mankind. We are there because we believe in the brotherhood of man throughout the world. We are indeed one community. I am reminded today of Wendell Willkie, who traveled throughout this land speaking of one world. Wendell Willkie's dream is near at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are on the dawn of the greatest era in this history of our Nation and the history of the world. It is a time for reverence, thanksgiving, and great rejoicing. This is another milestone in human progress. We as a nation can be grateful to our divine Creator who created the "heavens and the earth."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans share pride in the magnificent accomplishment of Apollo 11. Throughout the thrilling events of Sunday we were more united in thought and purpose than in many years.

Most of the world was one in the fervent wish and concern for the success of the Apollo 11 mission and its courageous crew.

The magnitude of the achievement and its inestimable impact on man dwarfs description.

The infinity of the universe demands more clearly humility of man that should move finite conflicts to solution.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to

join the citizens of the free world in voicing my congratulations and a "well done" to the three astronauts who participated in man's first journey to the moon.

I am extremely proud that the first men on the moon were Americans, although their accomplishment was on behalf of all mankind.

I agree with Dr. Wernher von Braun that such space exploration can only bring men nearer to God, and make His existence more real to the doubting Thomases.

With this unparalleled achievement we can look forward to still further unequaled and undreamed of space advances. It is my earnest hope and prayer that our moon landing will help further the cause of peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, while so much is being written about this great lunar feat, I feel the article entitled, "A Dream: A Man on the Moon" from the July 17 issue of the *Bulloch Herald of Statesboro, Ga.*, best describes the many scientific and technological efforts which are now historic achievements of the American space program.

I, therefore, commend that article to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

A DREAM: A MAN ON THE MOON

John Milton, English poet during the 1600's called her "The Silver-Footed Queen." Thomas Tickwell, English essayist and poet, called her "The Silver Empress of the Night," during the 1700's. Thomas Otway, English dramatist, called her "The Queen of Night" during the 1600's. William Shakespeare, English poet in the 1500's called her a "Silver Bow New Bent in Heaven."

Other poets have called her Goddess of the Night, Selene, Artemis, Cynthia, Luna, Musicians have ennobled her, lovers swore by her. And dogs howled at her.

Men worshipped her, feeling that her mystical powers influenced life on earth. She was unreachable, remote, the focus of poets, of shepherds and nomads, of lonely astronomers and not-so-lonely lovers.

The moon has inspired more superstition than any other celestial body. It has long been considered an omen of evil, especially when it eclipses the sun, or when its dark orb, faintly lit by earthshine, lies cradled in a silver crescent.

And even the full moon has held its terrors. From the remotest times it has been supposed that sleeping in full moonlight can cause blindness or madness. The very word "lunatic" derives from the Latin for moon.

Many farmers to this day plant some crops "by the moon."

As a boy we were fascinated by Jules Verne's story, "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865. The flight of Apollo 8, which began on December 21, 1968 and carried Astronauts Frank Borman, Jim Lovell and Bill Anders to the Moon, had some haunting parallels to that book. Verne had a crew of three in his spacecraft. They took off in December. They took off from near Tampa, Florida. And when they finally got back to earth they landed in the Pacific.

In 1969, in the twelfth year of the Space Age, the moon, earth's natural satellite, has become the concern of every man, and the object of the most intensive scientific and technological effort in man's history. It is estimated that more than a million people were gathered in the launch area at Cape Kennedy on yesterday morning, July 16, when Neil Armstrong, commander; Michael Collins, command module pilot; and Edwin Aldrin, lunar module pilot, took off in Apollo 11 for the Moon.

For centuries man has been looking at the moon, in wonderment and puzzlement. Then in 1609, a man named Galileo built the first astronomical telescope and looking at the moon discovered that it, shining with reflected light, had an uneven mountainous surface.

Since then the moon has claimed the full attention of astronomers, astrophysicists, astrochemists, stargazers, astrologers and soothsayers.

It was not until October 4, 1957, that man's hope of someday going to the moon was stimulated into the possibility of realization with the launching of the first man-made satellite, Sputnik I, by the Russians.

Two months later on December 6, with the world watching, our nation's "Vanguard" stood ready to boost a three-pound mini-satellite into space. When fired for lift-off, the slender rocket rose just two feet off its pad, lost thrust and crumbled to the ground in a massive explosion. American prestige in the space field tumbled with it and man's hope dimmed.

But hope burns eternal in the breast of man and it flamed up again with the first earth satellite, Explorer I, being sent into orbit from Cape Kennedy on January 31, 1958.

And just a little more than three years later, on April 12, 1961, man broke his earthly bonds when Russian Major Yuri Gagarin went into orbit and returned to earth after one circuit. Less than one month later on May 5, America's first spaceman, Navy Commander Alan B. Shepard Jr., rode a Redstone rocket briefly over the threshold of space on a 15-minute suborbit flight. By this time, the United States began recovering from shock of the December 6, 1957, failure of the Vanguard.

Then on May 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy went before a joint session of Congress and told its members, "I believe this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before the decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the longterm exploration of space; and none will be more difficult or expensive to accomplish."

With the flames of hope fanned into new heights, a massive industry-government-military team went to work and miracles began happening.

On February 20, 1962, John Glenn Jr. became the first American to orbit the earth when he was sent into space atop an Atlas rocket in Friendship 7 Mercury capsule. He became the nation's hero and man's hopes soared.

Three months later, on May 24, 1962, Commander M. Scott Carpenter made a three-orbit flight in the Mercury capsule, Aurora 7, and then on October 3, Commander Walter M. Schirra Jr., orbited the earth six times in the Mercury capsule Sigma 7.

In August of that year, the Russians sent their third and fourth cosmonauts into orbit on August 11 and 12. One orbited the earth 64 times and the other 48 times.

The era of the Mercury flights ended May 15-16 of 1963 when Air Force Major Gordon L. Cooper Jr. orbited the earth 22 times. The next month on June 14, the fifth Russian flew in space and made 81 orbits. Two days later on June 16, the first woman space traveler, a Russian, made 81 orbits around the earth.

It was not until March of 1965, that the Gemini flights were inaugurated, but in the meantime on July 31, 1964, the United States sent Ranger 7 to the moon to make pictures. It relayed thousands of close-up photographs of the moon before crashing on the lunar surface.

And the Russians continued sending men into space. A spacecraft carrying three men was launched by the Soviet Union on October 12 and made 16 orbits.

It was a Russian, Aleksei A. Leonov, who on March 18, 1965, went into orbit and be-

came the first man "to walk in space," when he stepped out into space from his spaceship Voskhod 2.

With the first Gemini flight by Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Virgil I. Grissom and Navy Lieutenant Commander John W. Young, in March of 1965, the United States moved ahead in its objective to reach the moon.

Two months later, on June 3, Major Edward H. White, stirred the hopes of Americans that man was getting closer to the dream of landing on the moon. It was Major White who stepped out of his Gemini 4 spacecraft and "walked in space" for 20 minutes.

And on December 4, Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Frank Borman and Navy Commander James A. Lovell Jr. were successfully launched into space in Gemini 7. They circled the earth 206 times in 330 hours and 35 minutes. On December 15, Gemini 6 Astronauts Walter M. Schirra Jr. and Thomas P. Stafford were launched to conduct a rendezvous exercise with Gemini 7. They made 16 revolutions around the earth in its 25-hour, 48-minute flight. During that time the spacecraft maneuvered to within six feet of Gemini 7 and maintained formation with it for five and one-half hours.

It was in 1966 that the moon began to feel the impact of the determination of the United States and Russia to put a man on it.

On February 3, 1966, the Russians made the first soft landing on the surface of the moon by an unmanned spacecraft.

At 10 a.m. on March 16, 1966, an Atlas rocket, carrying Gemini 8's Agena target began its journey into orbit. One hour and 41 minutes later, Astronauts Neil Armstrong and David Scott rode their Titan rocket skyward. During the next six hours, Armstrong and Scott pursued Agena four times around the earth, and succeeded in "docking" with it. But trouble developed and when they persisted, Gemini 8 splashed down in the Pacific. There was disappointment, for Scott's scheduled "walk in space" was cancelled.

On June 2, four months later, the United States made its first soft landing on the moon with Surveyor 1. Then on September 12, the U.S. spacecraft Gemini 11 successfully performed a "docking" operation with a 26-foot Agena-D target.

And with the last Gemini Flight in November of 1966, the United States was set to move into its program of manned Apollo flights and the word was that we'd have a man on the moon in 1968.

But it was not to be so. For 1967 brought disaster and tragedy to the space programs of both the United States and Russia.

It was on January 27, 1967, that the United States and the world went into a state of shock upon learning that three U.S. astronauts died in a sudden fire which engulfed the capsule of their Apollo 1 spacecraft while it was on the ground at Cape Kennedy. They were Air Force Colonel Virgil I. Grissom, Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Edward H. White and Navy Lieutenant Commander Roger F. Chaffee. Colonel Grissom was one of the first seven Mercury project astronauts. Colonel White was the first American to "walk in space." And Commander Chaffee was preparing to make his first flight. The tragedy occurred at 6:31 p.m. while the men, dressed in their spacesuits were participating in a full-scale simulation of the Apollo program's first launching which had been scheduled for February 27.

Three months later, on April 24, Russian Cosmonaut Vladimir M. Komarov was returning to earth after a day in orbit when his spacecraft's parachute straps became twisted, causing the ship to crash, killing its pilot.

The January 27th fire was a tragic blow to America's hope to land a man on the moon. But space officials continued to work on the program, despite the delay they knew would develop in meeting their space program schedules. Before another of the Apollo series

was to get off the ground, three U.S. Lunar Orbiters and three Surveyors were sent into space to collect thousands of photographs of the moon and made chemical analyses of its surface.

Then on November 9, Apollo 4, was sent on an unmanned flight. It was the first since the January 27 fire and the first launch of the giant Saturn 5 booster designed to send man to the moon.

1968 began with the launching of Surveyor 7 on January 7. It was the last of the robot moon-landing series to shoot more photographs and analyze the lunar surface. Surveyor 7 also revealed earth-type basalt and volcanic rock to support the theory that the moon was born either with or from the earth.

And before the month was out, Apollo 5, on January 22, was sent on an unmanned mission, carrying the first "LEM" which is the short name for the lunar module which will set Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin on the Moon at 4:19 p.m., July 20.

Then on April 4, the huge Saturn 5 booster got its second test when it carried Apollo 6 into space. It was considered a success despite excess vibrations in the first stage, a malfunctioning engine in the second stage and the failure of the third stage to restart in space.

By October, the January 17, 1967 disaster had become history and man was ready to challenge space. On October 11, Apollo 7, atop a Saturn, carried Navy Captain Walter M. Schirra Jr., Air Force Major Don F. Elsie and Civilian Walter Cunningham into orbit for 11 perfect days during which they circled the earth 163 times. Apollo program director, Air Force Lieutenant General Samuel C. Phillips, declared the flight "the first space operation that has accomplished more than 100 per cent of its preplanned objectives."

And the stage was set for that most fantastic voyage climaxed by Apollo 8's rendezvous with the Moon, which began with lift-off at Cape Kennedy at 7:51 a.m. on December 21, 1968.

This was the flight when three Americans became the first human beings to escape from the gravitational pull of the earth and to orbit another celestial body.

And man almost touched the moon.

This was the flight during which millions of people all over the world heard Command Pilot Air Force Colonel Frank Borman describe the moon as being "a vast lonely forbidding type of existence, a great expanse of nothing, that looks rather like clouds and clouds of pumice stone . . . It certainly would not appear to be a very inviting place to live or work." Navy Captain James A. Lovell declared "the vast loneliness of the moon up here is awe-inspiring, and it makes you realize just what you have back there on earth. The earth from here is a grand oasis to the big vastness of space." And Air Force Major William A. Anders was impressed by the lunar sunrises and sunsets.

It was these three men who touched the hearts and souls of men on earth, when, near the time for them to head for home, Major Anders introduced what many people remember as the most moving moment of the flight when he said, "For all the people back on earth, the crew of Apollo 8 has a message that we would like to send to you."

And so these three astronauts, who more than any other men have seen the evidence of creation, paused in their voyage to the moon to read, in turn, the most appropriate words imaginable for the scene below them—the majestic opening words of the book of Genesis.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth and the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good: and

God divided the light from the darkness . . . And God saw that it was good."

"And from the crew of Apollo 8, we pause with good night, good luck, a Merry Christmas, and God bless all of you—all of you on the good earth."

And with the first light of dawn on December 27, just five days before the end of 1968, Apollo splashed down in the Pacific and the astronauts climbed out—to the plaudits of a waiting world.

And man's spirit was lifted and his hopes for landing on the moon seemed ever so close.

Yet, there remained one more test to be made. The vehicle, which is to ease man down to the surface of the moon was yet to be proven—in space, with men at its controls. Called "LEM" the lunar module has made one Apollo flight—unmanned and unsuccessful.

And so Apollo 9 was given the business to answer the question, "Can man be put ON the moon and be lifted OFF safely? And on the fifth day of Apollo 9's flight which began on March 3, 1969, U.S. spacemen had their answer, loud and clear, "It can be done."

The big test came on March 7 when Astronauts Col. James A. McDivitt and Civilian Russell L. Schweickart, put "LEM" through its paces about 150 miles above the earth—zipping through space at 17,500 miles an hour. For nearly six and a half hours, the astronauts flew the "space spider" independently of its mother ship, simulating a moon landing.

Then they returned to the waiting Apollo command, piloted in their absence by David R. Scott. Five more days of other testing and maneuvers were carried out before Apollo 9 splashed down in the Atlantic near Bermuda on March 13.

And man reached still closer to the moon. America was now ready for a final flight, the flight which was to be the dress rehearsal to tie up all the loose ends for putting man on the moon.

On May 18 Apollo 10 was sent into space. Riding it were Astronauts Thomas Stafford, John Young and Eugene Cernan. They were to get the answers to the questions, Is it safe to land on the area selected for the touchdown? and will LEM (the lunar module) slow down enough for a "soft" landing?

On May 26, Apollo 10 splashed down in the Pacific with the answers . . . Yes.

They had guided LEM to within nine miles of the surface of the moon to scout the site which had been selected for Apollo 11.

And yesterday morning, Wednesday, July 16, at 9:32 o'clock, Apollo 11 lifted off with Astronauts Neil H. Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr. on their way to the realization of man's age-old dream to land a man on the moon.

Riding with them are the prayers of all men of good will.

If it be God's will, let it be so.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the words "that is one small step for man, one giant step for mankind," pioneer astronaut Neil Armstrong set foot on the surface of the moon for the first time in the history of mankind.

Shortly after, his companion, Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin was on the moon's surface and together they began the scientific exploration of that planetary body. The data they bring back will enable our scientists to make studies of the composition of the lunar surface and provide us with information in furthering the space program and better scientific understanding of that celestial body and earth as a part of the solar system.

This great achievement in man's desire to reach the moon is the culmination

of a dream by the "father of rocketry," Dr. Robert H. Goddard. On March 16, 1926, Dr. Goddard demonstrated the practicality of rockets at Auburn, Mass., with the first liquid fuel rocket flight; the rocket traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds. After that trial flight, he stated that some day man will travel to the moon by rocket. Yesterday this dream became a reality.

It is unfortunate that the man who did so much to advance the space program was not with us to share in the glory of this historic flight. President John F. Kennedy, who had set as a national goal a moon landing in the 1970's would have rejoiced with all of America that this achievement was made possible before the timetable set by him. In proposing this, President Kennedy said on May 25, 1961:

I believe that this nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to the earth.

Much credit must be given to the late President for his determination to proceed with this moon mission, in spite of opposition from many sources.

There is much in our space program which shows it to be a wise investment for the future. Looking behind the fanfare of the space flights, we can see the steady and significant contributions of our space program to education, medicine, communications, weather forecasting, and the whole range of technological development—electronics, computers, metallurgy, and more.

We have trained thousands of scientists under space grants. Almost \$800 million have been distributed directly to colleges and universities under the space program. These grants have helped to break down the compartmentalization of our universities—there is now more interdisciplinary cooperation. The schools of engineering are working with the schools of medicine, and physicists are working with psychologists.

Space has required a more exact science of medicine than we have ever known before. We are learning much more about the human body and how it reacts to stress.

Without the space program, there would have been no communications satellites, which are revolutionizing worldwide communications and which will help make education available to people in every area of the world.

Weather satellites can save billions of dollars for farmers and industry through more accurate forecasting. The advance warning of storms can save both lives and property.

The space program, more than any other single development, has upgraded American industry and management. In fact, the space program is just another name for excellence in American technology. It has helped fuel our fantastic economic growth and contributed to our capacity to compete with other countries, despite their lower labor costs.

Our mastery of space has contributed significantly to our national security, and beyond that, has opened the skies to allow the kind of inspection that will

have to accompany arms control agreements.

Space exploration has promoted international cooperation—the best minds of different nations are working together to solve common problems. If we pursue this opportunity, we can work with the Soviet Union and other nations in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Earth resource satellites can help us feed the people of earth. These satellites will find water to make deserts bloom. They can detect disease in crops. They can find schools of fish and discover mineral deposits.

These earth resource satellites, in themselves, will repay our investment in the space program.

Perhaps most important of all, our voyage to the moon has shown us that if we make a commitment and work together, we can do almost anything.

We made a commitment to put a man on the moon, and we kept it.

The landing of Americans on the moon is one of the most thrilling moments in history. If we can spend billions on a vast space program, then we can also create a world where hunger, war, and economic insecurity are no longer problems of man. While we have been successful in meeting scientific challenges in a flight to the moon, man has failed in many of the other important issues of life.

We must make a similar commitment to rebuild our cities, to clean up our air and water, to provide quality education and health care to all of our people.

If Government, private enterprise, and our colleges and universities work together to rebuild our cities in the same way they cooperated on the space program, we can do it by 1976—the 200th anniversary of our birth.

To put a man on the moon requires the best we have in private and public sectors. To put a man on his feet here on earth also calls for the best that is in us.

Our space program has given us pride and confidence as a people. Man does not live by bread alone. Our space achievements represent more than just wealth and power. They are testimony to the quality of our people. Our astronauts grew up in America, and they represent the hopes and aspirations of all the American people.

So the space program is more than just adventure, scientific miracles, expensive hardware, and costly experimentation. It has enriched all of us, and someday it will carry us into our neighborhood of tomorrow—the solar system.

We are all children of the sun, and our journeys into space will both increase our knowledge of the universe and improve the lives of all of us here on this good earth.

There are still several Apollo missions planned in this series and will cost an estimated \$300 to \$350 million each. The monumental achievement of yesterday's moon landing is something which the Nation must consider in the future—continue probing the space on a wider base or to turn to our domestic problems which could become a lever toward making the earth a better place to live in.

We must not minimize the achievements of the two astronauts who actually imprinted their footprints on the lunar

surface, but we must also salute Mike Collins who is to bring back the heroic trio of Apollo 11.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my personal congratulations to astronauts Collins, Armstrong, and Aldrin for their success in reaching the moon, and I pray that their return will be in accordance with all previously determined flight plans.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, last night the whole world was watching when first one and then a second American set foot on the moon. In one sense, this historic event was the culmination of a long series of events known as our moon program, yet in a larger sense it might more likely be characterized as another beginning in our exploration of outer space.

This signal accomplishment cannot pass without a personal expression of appreciation and admiration for all of the dedicated individuals who have participated in our space program. Obviously, tremendous contributions have been made by our courageous astronauts, and also by those scientists, technicians, and workers directly and indirectly involved in the program.

But, Mr. Speaker, in our rush to share the glory and wealth of this fantastic experience and accomplishment with all the world—as we should properly do—let us not forget for a moment that this is an American achievement in which we as a nation and as a people should have justifiable pride. Our Nation has expended vast sums of its national resources to accomplish what we have in space, and in this regard, Mr. Speaker, all Americans have certainly participated.

MOON DAY—NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION

(Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today Neil A. Armstrong, Col. Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Lt. Col. Michael Collins are about to successfully conclude one of history's most incredible ventures.

Through the magic of television, almost the entire world last night watched with fascination as these three men demonstrated they were not only finely trained, but that they possessed that intangible extra something—an awareness that they were pioneering for all men everywhere.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which calls for the designation of the third Monday of July as a national day of recognition, to be known as Moon Day, in honor of Apollo 11, its crewmembers, and man's achievement.

This measure also provides for the issuance of commemorative postage stamps and medals in honor of astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Mike Collins.

Because of the significance of this event, I propose the issuance of a three-value set of commemorative postage stamps showing the faces of the three Apollo 11 crewmen. The moon stamp previously prepared does not show the

faces, because postal regulations normally prohibit showing the faces of living persons on U.S. stamps. Certainly the triumph of Apollo 11 will be magnified if we waive that provision to honor this successful mission which equals some of the most astonishing dreams of fiction.

The three astronauts would receive a special gold commemorative medal, with silver copies of the design presented to the other American astronauts who participated in space flight or their next of kin. Bronze copies of the medal, at the cost of manufacture, will be prepared for sale to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the unequalled historic significance of the successful landing on the moon by the astronauts is worthy of continued commemoration by the people of the United States, and, indeed, all mankind.

The skill, energy, and courage with which we have approached the exploration of space helps restore the national confidence in the strength of our own powers of commitment and determination to tackle man's earthly ills and meet the challenges which, for a moment, the astronauts have left behind.

LUNAR DAY

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the greatest scientific and technological accomplishment in the history of the world. When our men planted the Stars and Stripes of our country on the moon, it was a tribute to the dynamic progress, ingenuity, and cooperation of the American people. It was a tribute to our private enterprise system. It was a tribute to our form of government with its emphasis on the dignity and worth of the individual. It was a tribute to the incomparable team of Government, industry, and academic community which made this feat possible. It was a tribute to the Congress which authored the program and the American people who supported it. It was a tribute to the valor, courage, and gallantry of America's spacemen, their families, and the millions who supported them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for reverence and thanksgiving to the Creator of the universe and Creator of man whom He endowed with dominion over all the creatures of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution designating this day as a national holiday and a day annually to pay tribute to these brave pioneers of space, who today unlocked the door to a billion secrets.

While flying to this session this morning from Columbia, the capital city of South Carolina, I read a very excellent and timely editorial in *The State* which prompted me to introduce this resolution calling for a Lunar Day. This outstanding editorial follows:

A DAY FOR APOLLO

"The Eagle has landed," said Astronaut Neil Armstrong matter-of-factly.

Those simple words, spoken Sunday afternoon, packed as much drama, perhaps more,

than any ever spoken up to that moment. And the world applauded spontaneously.

They marked man's first touchdown in space and assured a place in history for Apollo 11 and her valiant crew even if no other parts of the breath-taking mission were carried out.

By the time this appears in print, another momentous milestone should have been reached. Armstrong should have made the first human footprint on the moon's surface in full view of a nation too proud and too excited to sleep.

Old Glory has never flown so high, literally and figuratively, and America surely will want to commemorate the event in an appropriate manner for as long as the flag flies.

This journey is not over. Other milestones, dangerous ones, lie just ahead. But whatever happens now, this day, July 21, 1969, will forever be etched in memory. The President has declared it to be a National Day of Participation, and that is entirely fitting. But each anniversary of the first touchdown or the first footfall, which ever seems most appropriate, should be declared a permanent national holiday by Congress.

If the mission continues according to plan, the most appropriate day would seem to be July 21.

Objections to making July 21 a national Holiday do arise, but they are minor. Chief among them is this: as the space age progresses, other achievements will rival the Apollo 11 mission in drama, daring, and importance. It will be impossible to honor each of these coming events with a separate holiday.

But it will be unnecessary to do so, any more than separate days are set aside to honor the veterans of each of America's wars. One day, November 11, has been made a time for remembering the sacrifice of all these veterans. The day selected for this observance, however, is the day on which hostilities ceased in World War I.

So it could be with space exploration: one day honoring all the nation's space achievements, that day being July 21, the climax of the Apollo program. On this day in 1969, "men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon," as the plaque on the lunar module reads. No matter what new adventures lie ahead, this day will be remembered always as the first major step in man's quest of the universe.

How would the new national holiday be designated? This close to the Apollo mission, the temptation would be strong to call it "Apollo Day," and this name would do well enough in the beginning. But later on, as other breath-taking landings and explorations occur, the name would become less and less appropriate. "Space Day," though otherwise suitable, has an unpleasant ring to the ear. "Exploration Day" is a possibility, but too general a designation, the "Space Exploration Day" is too much of a mouthful.

The name is really unimportant. A tentative designation could be adopted and then changed as the need arose. But surely the nation will not fail to recognize the historic significance of the Apollo 11 mission and see that it is suitably commemorated.

SHOE INDUSTRY

(Mr. KEITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the domestic shoe industry in general, and its New England segment in particular, are being especially hard hit by the influx of foreign-made shoes. Those of us from shoe-producing districts are well aware of the great harm being done to this important industry and are doing our best to gen-

erate congressional and Executive support for remedial measures.

Last February a number of us filed legislation to establish a shoe import quota system in the United States. More recently a concerted effort was made by concerned legislators to persuade the President to work toward voluntary shoe quotas similar to those contemplated for textiles. A letter urging such a step, and signed by over 300 Members of Congress, was recently sent to the President and we are awaiting his reaction to it.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that concern with this problem exists at all levels of Government. On July 8 of this year the Massachusetts House of Representatives passed a resolution urging Federal action to protect and promote the domestic shoe industry. So that all Members might take note of this important resolution, I include it at this point in the RECORD under unanimous consent.

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADOPT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE THE SHOE INDUSTRY

Whereas, Many shoe factories have closed down in the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, The import of low-cost shoes with low-tariff duties has glutted the shoe market to the detriment of the shoe industry and threaten to destroy one of the Commonwealth's most vital industries; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to protect the shoe industry so vital to the economy of the country and to subsidize said industry in areas where it may be necessary so that the industry will not be wiped out in various parts of the country, particularly in the New England area and the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, July 8, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

APOLLO 11

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the successful landing upon, exploration of, and take-off from the moon has been truly the most significant achievement of the 20th century. In years to come, it will may be regarded as the most important of all human history up to that time.

Not only where no man ever stood before, but where no life as we knew it had ever existed; not only attaining supremacy over his own environment, but over one totally alien to human experience; not only a step in mastery of his own world, but the first step in the seven-league-boot strides that will take him to the stars.

This solely American achievement has

given our Republic a lead over other nations, it is true, but a lead with responsibilities and implications far, far beyond what we may imagine.

For is it not only truly man's destiny to push on? Let us remember, man is the only animal among all the vertebrates whose head does not point toward the ground when he walks. Man's eyes have always been fixed upon the horizon, or the stars.

Voices have been raised and will be raised again in days to come to attempt to play down this feat. By implication, what was done will be defamed and defiled, and we will once again be lashed by small and petty men who deal in terms of mass guilt and mass shame. We will be chastised, as individuals and as a nation, because while many ills exist upon the earth, we have set our goal into the heavens.

But these men forget that there come times in human existence when singular or collective efforts of men, or of nations, rise to the greatest challenge of all: the challenge of meeting what man's destiny must surely be. There come times when the pace of man's advance surges and roars ahead with one gigantic bound.

Man must make this jump, when the time is there, or he stands in danger of turning his back upon what he was ultimately meant to be, what he ultimately can be, and what he ultimately will be. We have our dreams; we have our faith; we have our courage; and we have our hope. These things rode with Apollo 11, as they will always ride on more such journeys to come.

In 1935, H. G. Wells wrote that:

For man there is no rest and no ending. He must go on—conquest beyond conquest. This little planet and its winds and ways, and all the laws of mind and matter that restrain him. Then the planets about him, and at last out across immensity to the stars. And when he has conquered all the deeps of space and all the mysteries of time—still he will be but beginning.

So it will always be—so it must always be, for we are men and we do not live by bread alone. If some wish to cast their eyes on the ground, then it is they who go against the laws of nature and the laws of creation. Man is meant to look upwards and outwards. He has ventured beyond his horizons on earth and his head, still held high, now looks upwards, beyond the stars.

SYMBOL AND REALITY

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the President's trip to five Asian countries and to Romania can be measured in two ways:

First, the trip will symbolize the President's concern for peace in Asia and his belief that Asians can and must themselves be the source of a progressive, peaceful last third of this century in Asia. The trip to Romania will symbolize the President's deep commitment to the furtherance of mutual understanding between the nations of Eastern Europe and the United States.

Yet, as important as this journey will

be as a symbol, more important will be the actuality of what the trip is; an act of personal diplomacy on the part of the leader of the most powerful nation in the world, an act which, more than any words, will impress upon the nations of Asia, of Eastern Europe, and of all the world that here is a President willing to go where the action is, eager to see for himself the problems and the promise of Asia and of Eastern Europe.

So, both as a symbol and as a reality, the President's trip will help to show the world that the quest for peace and progress among the nations of the world is uppermost on the President's mind and that he wants to see at firsthand these complex, dynamic, profoundly important sections of the world.

MAN ON THE MOON

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, man on the moon in our lifetime is a wondrous milestone in the eternity of the universe and the history of our planet earth.

Conceived in the ideals of peace, demonstrated for all the world to see, and executed with man's unfailing response to extreme challenge, the moon adventure symbolizes mankind's unlimited capacity.

The courage and competence of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as they led all mankind to the gateway of the universe strengthens our faith in man's ability to conquer problems.

The wondrous technology that compressed time to produce this feat reassures us of the strength of our country, our system, and its ability to provide a better life for all people.

AMERICA'S PIONEERS ON THE MOON

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day for all mankind I take this moment to congratulate and pay tribute to America's pioneers on the moon, Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin, and to their fellow astronaut, Michael Collins, who awaits their return to the command ship.

Their accomplishments, publicly viewed on television by hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, truly have brought all of us on earth closer together. This is a proud day for every American. We owe a great deal to these brave men who have blazed the long and unknown trail to the moon, and to our other astronauts who contributed to the knowledge which resulted in last night's fantastic event.

There also are thousands here on earth who have helped make the impossible dream come true. Some 300,000 technicians and 20,000 corporations were involved in this program. I want to salute the men and women in the Fourth District of Kansas who played and important part in the success which we com-

memorate today. The aerospace capabilities of the Wichita Division of the Boeing Co. were instrumental in the building of the Saturn V booster which rocketed the men of Apollo 11 into orbit and Beech Aircraft Corp. of Wichita also contributed valuable technology to this program.

While we pray for the safe return of our astronauts on Thursday, we revel in the success already recorded. Man has conquered the moon, and by this victory he has demonstrated that he is able to conquer the perplexing problems which confront him here on earth.

MAN WALKS ON THE MOON

(Mr. WOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is the nature of man to find new frontiers and to conquer them. But no step into the unknown has eclipsed the feat of the Americans of Apollo 11 who have carried man and his technology to another celestial body. The accomplishment speaks as much for our politics as for our scientific ability. No nation that has entered space has had the courage and candor to permit its people to witness the events as they unfolded. We allowed not only our people, but all the peoples whose governments would permit them free access to information sources, to watch the dramatic and historic first step of man onto earth's space satellite.

A popular magazine commented not long ago that one cause of the campus unrest in our Nation is that America had run out of heroes; that machines and technology had replaced the mighty men of adventure and grit who opened our land to make America the most powerful of nations. I hope that those who wrote that comment watched their television last night when Americans with solid roots in traditional society and culture wrote history in large letters across the heavens. We found our new heroes. All Americans who have brought the Apollo program from infancy to history have a legitimate share of this unprecedented accomplishment.

What the men of Apollo 11 and the thousands who supported them have done will live through all of recorded history and we join their families now in praying for the successful conclusion of their flight and their safe return to earth.

A DAY OF NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT FOR MANKIND

(Mr. McDADE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that there will ever be a day in the lives of any of us that will be more significant than was yesterday, the 20th of July.

Through the magic of radio, we listened while man achieved the dream of all ages by landing on the moon. Later that evening, through the miracle of television, we watched while the feet of Neil Armstrong took the last step to

make him the first man to walk on any other celestial body in this universe.

No words we speak here could begin to match the enormity of that triumph. I know that all of you, my colleagues, join me in extending the warmest congratulations and best wishes to Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin and to Michael Collins for their remarkable accomplishment. I know, also, that all of you join me in prayer that God will bring these three brave and splendid Americans home in safety to their families, to the Nation and, indeed, to the whole human race which awaits their return.

A man on the streets of Paris said:

I have always had faith in America. I knew it would be successful. After all they have done for the world, I knew they would be first on the moon; and I am proud for them.

We will share that pride.

A girl at Disneyland said:

Here I was visiting Tomorrowland, and suddenly it became today.

It is indeed a new world.

A Brazilian visiting in New York said:

It was fantastic, incredible. I take off my hat.

We all do.

Sir Bernard Lovell, that distinguished British astronomer, said:

There are no words to match the significance of this fantastic achievement.

No one will ever find words to match it.

Mr. Robert Heinlein, the distinguished science-fiction novelist, said:

We do not really understand how great this achievement is. It is the most remarkable thing that has ever been done in the history of the human race. Today is New Year's Day of the Year One. And if we do not change the calendar, history will do it for us.

All mankind was left virtually speechless by the grandeur of this achievement.

So to these three astronauts, to all the other astronauts who made this flight possible, to Robert Goddard and the men who followed him in planning this mission, to the thousands of industries, large and small, who built this spacecraft, to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who performed all the tasks to make this flight possible, and to you, my colleagues here in Congress, who voted the funds necessary for this fantastic voyage, I extend my warmest congratulations.

We came in peace. It is my hope that we may find that same peace here on earth. It is my hope that we will bring nothing but peace on all of the journeys across space that still lie before mankind. This is indeed the year 1 of mankind's history as a citizen, no longer of the earth, but of the universe.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 38) to consent to the Upper Niobrara River com-

pact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 38

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. Such compact reads as follows:

"UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT"

"The State of Wyoming, and the State of Nebraska, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as Wyoming and Nebraska, respectively, or individually as a 'State', or collectively as 'States'), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River Basin, and being duly authorized by Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved August 5, 1953 (Public Law 191, 83d Congress, 1st Session, Chapter 324, 67 Stat. 365) and the Act of May 29, 1958 (Public Law 85-427, 85th Congress, S. 2557, 72 Stat. 147) and the Act of August 30, 1961 (Public Law 87-181, 87th Congress, S. 2245, 75 Stat. 412) and pursuant to the Acts of their respective Legislatures have, through their respective Governors, appointed as their Commissioners: For Wyoming, Earl Lloyd, Andrew McMaster, Richard Pfister, John Christian, Eugene P. Willson, H. T. Person, Norman B. Gray, E. J. Van Camp; For Nebraska, Dan S. Jones, Jr., who after negotiations participated in by W. E. Blomgren appointed by the President of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I.

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for an equitable division or appointment of the available surface water supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin between the States; to provide for obtaining information on groundwater and underground water flow necessary for apportioning the underground flow by supplement to this compact; to remove all causes, present and future which might lead to controversies; and to promote interstate comity.

"B. The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Upper Niobrara River Basin constitute the basis for this compact; and neither of the States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Either State and all others using, claiming or in any other manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River Basin under the authority of that State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II.

"A. The term 'Upper Niobrara River' shall mean and include the Niobrara River and its tributaries in Nebraska and Wyoming west of Range 55 West of the 6th P.M.

"B. The term 'Upper Niobrara River Basin' or the term 'Basin' shall mean that area in Wyoming and Nebraska which is naturally drained by the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West of the 6th P.M.

"C. Where the name of a State or the term 'State' or 'States' is used, they shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Niobrara River under the authority of that State.

"ARTICLE III.

"It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data nec-

essary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The States agree that the United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, may collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of information necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE IV.

"Each State shall itself or in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging stations as are found necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V.

"A. Wyoming and Nebraska agree that the division of surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River shall be in accordance with the following provisions.

"1. There shall be no restrictions on the use of the surface waters of the Upper Niobrara River by Wyoming except as would be imposed under Wyoming law and the following limitations:

"(a) No reservoir constructed after August 1, 1957, and used solely for domestic and stock water purposes shall exceed 20 acre-feet in capacity.

"(b) Storage reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West of the 6th P.M. and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, Range 60 West of the 6th P.M. shall not store in any water year (October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next year) more than a total of 500 acre-feet of water.

"(c) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates prior to August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to June 1 of the next year and at such times during the period June 1 to September 30 that the water is not required to meet the legal requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West. Where water is pumped from such storage reservoirs, the quantity of storage water pumped or otherwise diverted for irrigation purposes or other beneficial purposes from any such reservoir in any water year shall be limited to the capacity of such reservoir as shown by the records of the Wyoming State Engineer's Office, unless additional storage water becomes available during the period June 1 to September 30 after meeting the legal diversion requirements by direct flow appropriations in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West.

"(d) Storage in reservoirs with priority dates after August 1, 1957, and storing water from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and the main stem of Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be made only during the period October 1 of one year to May 1 of the next year and at such times during the period May 1, and September 30 that the water is not required for direct diversion by ditches in Wyoming and in Nebraska west of Range 55 West.

"(e) Direct flow rights with priority dates after August 1, 1957, on the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North, shall be regulated on priority basis with Nebraska rights west of Range 55 West, provided, that any direct flow rights for a maximum of 143 acres which may be granted by the Wyoming State Engi-

neer with a priority date not later than July 1, 1961, for lands which had Territorial Rights under the Van Tassel No. 4 Ditch with a priority date of April 8, 1882, and the Van Tassel No. 5 Ditch with a priority date of April 18, 1882, shall be exempt from the provisions of this subsection (e).

"(f) All direct flow diversions from the main stem of the Niobrara River east of Range 62 West and from Van Tassel Creek south of Section 27, Township 32 North shall at all times be limited to their diversion rates as specified by Wyoming law, and provided that Wyoming laws relating to diversion of 'Surplus Water' (Wyoming Statutes, 1957, Sections 41-181 to 41-188 inclusive) shall apply only when the water flowing in the main channel of the Niobrara River west of Range 55 West is in excess of the legal diversion requirements of Nebraska ditches having priority dates before August 1, 1957.

"ARTICLE VI.

"A. Nebraska and Wyoming recognize that the future use of ground water for irrigation in the Niobrara River Basin may be a factor in the depletion of the surface flows of the Niobrara River, and since the data now available are inadequate to make a determination in regard to this matter, any apportionment of the ground water of the Niobrara River Basin should be delayed until such time as adequate data on ground water of the basin are available.

"B. To obtain data on ground water, Nebraska and Wyoming, with the cooperation and advice of the United States Geological Survey, Groundwater Branch, shall undertake ground water investigations in the Niobrara River Basin in the area of the Wyoming-Nebraska State line. The investigations shall be such as are agreed to by the State Engineer of Wyoming and the Director of Water Resources of Nebraska, and may include such observation wells as the said two officials agree are essential for the investigations. Costs of the investigations may be financed under the cooperative ground water programs between the United States Geological Survey and the States, and the States' share of the costs shall be borne equally by the two States.

"C. The ground water investigation shall begin within one year after the effective date of this compact. Upon collection of not more than twelve months of ground water data Nebraska and Wyoming, with the cooperation of the United States Geological Survey, shall make, or cause to be made, an analysis of such data to determine the desirability or necessity of apportioning the ground water by supplement to this compact. If, upon completion of the initial analysis, it is determined that apportionment of the ground water is not then desirable or necessary, reanalysis shall be made at not to exceed two-year intervals, using all data collected until such apportionment is made.

"D. When the results of the ground water investigations indicate that apportionment of ground water of the Niobrara River Basin is desirable, the two States shall proceed to negotiate a supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water of the basin.

"E. Any proposed supplement to this compact apportioning the ground water shall not become effective until ratified by the legislatures of the two States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"ARTICLE VII.

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended by action of the Legislatures of the Signatory States and until such amendment is consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified and consented to in order to become effective.

"ARTICLE VIII.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or

proceeding, legal or equitable, in any court of competent jurisdiction for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE IX.

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters; provided that, any beneficial use of the waters allocated by this compact hereafter made within a State by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"B. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

"C. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"D. To affect the obligations of the United States of America to Indians or Indian tribes, or any right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes which is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"ARTICLE X.

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, all other severable provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE XI.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified by the Legislatures of each of the Signatory States and by the Congress of the United States.

"IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and one copy of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Done at the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, this 26th day of October, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand and Nine Hundred Sixty Two 1962.

"Commissioner for the State of Nebraska

"Dan S. Jones, Jr.

"Commissioners for the State of Wyoming

"Earl Lloyd

"Andrew McMaster

"Richard Pfister

"John Christian

"Eugene P. Wilson

"H. T. Person

"Norman B. Gray

"E. J. Van Camp

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. Blomgren

"Representative of the United States of America".

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is reserved.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, instrumentalities, permittees, or licensees in, over, and to the use of the waters of the Upper Niobrara River Basin; nor to impair or affect their capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, S. 38 will give the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska through which these States will divide and apportion the waters of the Upper Niobrara River. The Congress authorized the negotiation of this compact by the act of August 5, 1953, and provided at that time that the compact so negotiated would not become binding until approved by the Congress. Such approval is the sole purpose and function of S. 38.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conducted hearings on this measure and found that the compact had been duly ratified by the legislatures of both Wyoming and Nebraska, that the executive branch has no difficulty with the compact and that it is widely supported by officials of both States and their congressional delegations.

Specifically, the compact which will be ratified by enactment of S. 38 does several things. It defines the limits of the Upper Niobrara River Basin, establishes criteria for apportionment of surface flows, and provides for subsequent inventory and apportionment of the ground water resources of the basin.

The passage of S. 38 would not authorize any Federal expenditures other than those involved in participation of the U.S. Geological Survey in the ground water inventory. This cost would be minimal and would be carried out as an adjunct of ongoing programs within the States and by the permanent continuing staff of the Geological Survey.

For the foregoing reasons, we have reported S. 38 favorably and urge its passage at this time.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE TO PROVIDE COST-OF-LIVING CASH RELIEF PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7517) to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 181 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 20) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) of such section as subsection (e) thereof; and

(2) by inserting immediately following subsection (b) of such section the following new subsections (c) and (d):

"(c) Each cash relief payment made pursuant to this section shall be increased on the same effective date and by the same per centum, adjusted to the nearest dollar, as civil service retirement annuities are increased under the cost-of-living adjustment provisions of section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"Such increase shall apply only to cash relief payments made after the date of enactment of this Act as increased by an-

nity increases made after such date of enactment under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) The Governor of the Canal Zone may pay cash relief to the widow of any former employee of the Canal Zone Government who, until the time of his death, receives or has received cash relief under subsection (a) of this section or under the Act of July 8, 1937. The term 'widow' as used in this section includes only the following:

"(1) a woman legally married to such employee at the time of his termination for disability and at his death.

"(2) a woman who, although not legally married to such former employee at the time of his termination, had resided continuously with him for at least five years immediately preceding the employee's termination under such circumstances as would at common law make the relationship a valid marriage and who continued to reside with him until his death.

"(3) a woman who has not remarried or assumed a common-law relationship with any other person.

Cash relief granted to such widows shall not at any time exceed 50 per centum of the rate at which cash relief, inclusive of any additional payment under subsection (b) of this section, would be payable to the former employee were he then alive."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the month following that in which it is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, lines 8 and 9, delete section 2 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. The increase in cash relief payments authorized by section 181(c) of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by this Act, shall apply only to cash relief payments made after the date of enactment of this Act and shall be based only on annuity increases under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code, that are made after the date of enactment of this Act. The cash relief payments authorized by section 181(d) of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by this Act, shall be payable to eligible individuals as determined by the Governor on the first day of each month following the month in which this Act is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ENTRANCE ROAD AT GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11609) to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved September 9, 1963 (77 Stat. 154), authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, is amended—

(1) by striking out, in the first sentence of section 1, the words "on North Carolina Highway Numbered 107 close to its point of

interchange with Interstate Route Numbered 40, near Hepco, North Carolina, to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road, and to construct the entrance road on the donated land;" and inserting in lieu thereof the words: "near the intersection at White Oak Church of North Carolina Routes Numbered 1338 and 1346 to the eastern boundary of the park in the vicinity of the Cataloochee section, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land for the construction of the entrance road together with the necessary interchange with said Routes 1338 and 1346, and to construct the entrance road and the interchange on the donated land;"

(2) by striking out the words "four and two-tenths" and "five hundred and twenty-five" in the proviso of section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five and two-tenths" and "six hundred and fifty", respectively; and

(3) by striking out the figure "\$1,160,000" in section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the words: "\$2,500,000 (1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Abbitt	Flynt	Pepper
Addabbo	Ford	Pettis
Alexander	Gerald R.	Powell
Anderson,	Ford,	Purcell
Tenn.	William D.	Quillen
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Rallsback
Ashley	Gallagher	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Gaydos	Reifel
Beall, Md.	Gettys	Rooney, Pa.
Berry	Goldwater	Roudebush
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	St Germain
Boggs	Halpern	St. Onge
Bolling	Hanley	Sandman
Brademas	Hanna	Scheuer
Brock	Hastings	Sebelius
Cahill	Henderson	Shipley
Camp	Howard	Snyder
Carey	Jonas	Springer
Casey	Kee	Stuckey
Clawson, Del	Kirwan	Taft
Clay	Kleppe	Talcott
Corbett	Leggett	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Lowenstein	Tiernan
Cunningham	Lukens	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Waldie
Davis, Wis.	McCloskey	Wampler
Delaney	May	Watkins
Dent	Michel	Watson
Diggs	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Dingell	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Dwyer	Mizell	Winn
Edwards, Ala.	O'Konski	Zion
Findley	Ottenger	
Flood	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ENTRANCE ROAD AT GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11609 amends the act of 1963 which provides for the construction of the entrance road to the Cataloochee area of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina.

As amended by the committee, H.R. 11609 is essentially the same as H.R. 14074, which was approved by the House last year. The only substantive change in the bill recommended to the House by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee this year involves an updated cost estimate. The bill approved last year authorized an appropriation of \$2,200,000, based on 1967 prices; H.R. 11609 authorizes \$2,500,000 based on 1969 prices. This represents an increase of \$1,340,000 over the original authorization.

The original act in 1963 authorized the construction of the entrance road, but it expressly provided that the road would be 4.2 miles in length and would involve approximately 525 acres of land. After enactment of that legislation, more detailed studies were made and it was determined that a modified route would more appropriately satisfy the public need and more adequately provide for the safety of the traveling public. It is this revised route which this legislation would authorize.

The route contemplated by H.R. 11609 involves a road approximately 1 mile longer than the original road. It traverses a more complex area and it, also, includes an interchange rather than an at-grade crossing. The increased cost involved is largely attributable to these features.

As with other projects, Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina has agreed to acquire and donate the right-of-way for the entrance road and the interchange. In return, the National Park Service has promised, subject to this authorization and to the appropriation of the necessary funds, to construct the entrance road and the interchange in accordance with acceptable design standards.

I want to emphasize that the Great Smoky Mountains National Park is one of the most popular units of the national park system. In 1968, it had more visitors than Grand Canyon National Park, Yellowstone National Park, and Yosemite National Park all put together. The construction of this new entrance road will connect with an existing, but not easily accessible road, inside the park. In doing this, it will afford access to an outstanding wooded area of the park. It should help to distribute some of the visiting load within the park and, at the same time, afford park visitors with a

new opportunity for camping, picnicking, and other outdoor activities.

It is unfortunate that the construction of this entrance road has been delayed since its authorization several years ago. Detailed studies have been made and project plans are programed for the next fiscal year. Hopefully, it will be possible to commence construction, if funds can be made available, in the not too distant future.

In the course of the consideration of the merits of this legislation, the members of the committee have become very familiar with it. It was approved by the committee without dissent. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I recommend the favorable consideration of H.R. 11609, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Do I understand that 4.2 miles were to be built for \$1,160,000.

Mr. ASPINALL. No, the amount of the new construction will be the added amount of mileage made necessary to lengthen the road about 1 mile and the needed new interchange facilities necessary to take care of the safety of the traveling public.

There is no money authorized in this legislation to procure property for the park.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I understand that, but I do not know about the construction of the road.

According to the report, page 3 thereof, changing the length of the road right-of-way from 4.2 to 5.2 miles and the acreage of the right-of-way from 525 to 650 acres, increased the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction of the road from \$1,160,000 to \$2,500,000, an increase of \$1,340,000?

Mr. ASPINALL. I understand now what is bothering my friend. If you take the 1969 cost of construction, as I said in the beginning of my statement, it is not the figures that my friend from Iowa uses that are comparable. It is the \$2.2 million as compared to \$2.5 million. In other words, what is involved here is a difference of \$300,000 for that increased mileage and additional safety features. The other legislation did not have the prices brought up to the 1969 levels. This is where we find the additional \$1,340,000.

Mr. GROSS. So, what I thought was a 100-percent increase for 1 mile of roadway, based upon the figures set forth in the report, does not add up quite that way; is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will bear with me for just one further question, I note in the bill this language:

\$2,500,000 (1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Is this language which is normally used these days with reference to authorizations of this nature?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the language

we use in all of our reclamation projects at the present time. This permits us to take advantage of a receding of the cost of construction and at the same time it permits, without another authorization, us to go ahead and construct the facilities authorized without coming back for another authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if it was more, would you not have to come back, if the plus factor was brought into effect? In other words, you would have to come back would you not?

Mr. ASPINALL. For no more than any amount that may be in addition to that amount shown above cost increases are determined by price indices. In other words, we would not have to come back for any other authorization. That is the reason for this language.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but it seems to me that it is kind of an open-end proposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. We closed it, may I say to my friend. It is closed, very definitely, because the cost indices for increased costs of construction is well known and well used in all construction programs.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, to further relieve the mind of my colleague from Iowa, the increase in costs are primarily the result of increased volume construction and a change in design. The increased cost also involves some work in grading, a more permanent surface, and in marking, as well as other factors not included in the previous bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11609, a bill to amend the act of September 9, 1963, which authorized the construction of an entrance road to the Cataloochee section of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina.

H.R. 11609 amends the original authorization because a study in conjunction with the North Carolina State Highway Commission for selecting the location of the entrance road has shown that a different route and crossing than that initially contemplated is necessary to provide the needed access to this much visited national park.

The act of September 9, 1963, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land for the road right of way of approximately 4.2 miles in length and involving 525 acres. The act further authorized the appropriation of \$1,160,000 for construction of the entrance road on the lands so acquired.

Since the passage of the original authorization the construction of Interstate Highway 40 and other factors require this change in plans. H.R. 11609, therefore, amends the act of September 9, 1963, by revising the route of the road; increases the acreage of right of way from 525 acres to 650 acres, and increases the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction from \$1,160,000 to \$2,500,000.

This project has been a cooperative Federal-State effort. The State of North Carolina has secured the necessary right of way and constructed the eight-tenths

of a mile connecting link between Interstate Route 40 and the proposed entrance road and interchange.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the explanation made by the gentleman.

I seek information about this bill, and I believe I understand the enhancement of the highway safety, better construction, more ready accessibility for more people, to our national park, and all that part; but I recall several bills in the past Congress having to do with the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina, and other improvements including highways in that particular area.

Am I correct in assuming that this is one of those bills that we have passed in the last year or so for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina, and this is just an upgrading of the bill because of the increase in cost of construction, and because of enhancements of highway engineering; and, are we just enlarging one that we have previously passed, and that this is not another particular promotion—brought to mind by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member on the committee—as to North Carolina's contribution? Or are we again making another matching-the-funds grant to North Carolina for a turnout into their State?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague from Missouri that the answer to his inquiry is "No," what we are doing in this bill is vacating the action which we took in the House several years ago, when we authorized highway construction, and substituting an interchange for the intersection which has already been authorized.

Mr. HALL. This really supplants our prior action for the same general area, but it is not in addition thereto?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. This is not in addition to it. This is in place of the one that was authorized.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I want the gentleman from Missouri to be absolutely knowledgeable about this.

Last year the gentleman will remember we did extend the Blue Ridge Highway authorization authority. That has nothing to do with this legislation.

Last year we also sent to the House, but it was not acted upon by the other body, legislation identical to this with the exception of the upgraded prices to the additional amount of \$300,000.

We have already passed through the House this year a bill which gave certain land from the west side of the park to be used as a State highway and put under the jurisdiction of the State. This legislation took the dual jurisdiction away from the Park Service and gave it to the State.

Those are all the bills that we have had relative to this particular area.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this additional information that the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have given. Both gentlemen with their usual discernment have noted what was worrying me. This helps to relieve the situation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during each of the last 2 years over 6,600,000 people visited the Smoky Mountains National Park, making it the most visited national park in the Nation. Most of these people entered the park on U.S. 441, which runs from Gatlinburg, Tenn., to Cherokee, N.C. The National Park Service states that the most serious traffic problem in any national park in the Nation is in the Smoky Mountains National Park and on Highway 441. On a summer weekend or October weekend, traffic is bumper to bumper for 30 miles.

In an effort to alleviate this condition and disburse visitors into other sections of the park, the National Park Service is seeking to take advantage of the fact that I-40, running from Knoxville to Asheville, close to the eastern edge of the park, was completed and opened to traffic last fall.

In 1963, Congress passed a bill authorizing the construction of a scenic road from I-40 to the edge of the Smoky Mountains National Park. The road was to continue inside the park 4 miles to the heart of the Cataloochee Valley, which has great potential for development of campsites, picnic areas, nature trails, and so forth.

It will enable park visitors to have access to a beautiful, somewhat isolated section of the park for camping, picnicking, and other outdoor activities, but it is not within a wilderness area. People once lived in this area, and some old homes and barns are still standing in the open valley. This is not the road in the Smoky Mountains National Park which has been opposed by conservationists. This road will make the Cataloochee area the most accessible section of the Smoky Mountains National Park, being only 1 hour's drive from Asheville and a 1½-hour drive from Knoxville on an interstate road.

The 4-mile section of this road located within the park has been completed and is ready for use.

The section of road authorized by the 1963 act was to be a cooperative Federal-State effort. The State of North Carolina has acquired the entire right-of-way for the road and is building an eight-tenths of a mile connecting road between I-40 and the beginning of the Park Service road. The National Park Service, as authorized by the 1963 act, will construct the entrance road.

As plans became more definite and detailed, it became evident that the cooperative Federal-State plan required an entrance road of greater length than had been anticipated earlier. It also became evident that an interchange was

needed at a point where the road crossed an existing State road. The decision to build the interchange was dictated by safety considerations. It also became evident that in order to build a road of the desired standards, the 1963 authorization was inadequate, and that an increase in the cost limit was necessary.

H.R. 11609 contains the recommended cost increase authorization, which amounts to \$1,340,000, and authorizes lengthening the road from 4.2 miles to 5.2 miles, and revises the description of the route. One-half of the extra cost was made necessary because of the decision to construct the interchange.

The situation in brief now is that we have constructed one-half of the scenic road designed to ease traffic congestion and open up an additional section of the Smoky Mountains National Park. This is the authorization that we need in order to build the other half.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11609, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. In view of the holiday and the importance of this bill and the scheduling of the session today, I think we ought to have a rollcall, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 3, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—341

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
 Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio

Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.

Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frey
Friedel

Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galfanakis
Garmatz
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Kazen
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade

McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKeally
McMillan
Maddison,
Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts

NAYS—3

Conyers

Jacobs

Landgrebe

NOT VOTING—88

Abbitt
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Tenn.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Beall, Md.
Berry
Blatnik
Brook
Camp
Carey
Casey
Clay
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Evins, Tenn.

Findley
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hanley
Hastings
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Jonas
Kee
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Lukens
McCarthy
Mailliard
May
Michel

Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggoner
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rouben-
bush.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Michel.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Edwards of Ala-
bama.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Stuckey with Mrs. May.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Young with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Watkins with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE NUTRITIOUS MEALS TO NEEDY CHILDREN

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11651), to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1752) is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new section:

"TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE NUTRITIOUS MEALS TO THE NEEDY CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AND IN OTHER GROUP ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL

"Sec. 14. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture

is authorized to use during the fiscal year 1970, not to exceed \$100,000,000 per annum in funds from section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), to formulate and carry out a program to improve the nutrition of needy children in group situations away from home, excluding situations where children are maintained in residence.

"(b)(1) Of the funds to be used for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 3 per centum for apportionment to Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall each be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such reserved funds as the number of children aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in each bears to the total number of children of such ages in all of them. For the purposes of this section "State" includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) From the remainder of the funds to be used for this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to each State, other than those listed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, an amount which bears the same ratio to such remaining funds as (1) the number of children in that State aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in families with incomes of less than \$3,000 per annum, and (2) the number of children in that State aged three to seventeen, inclusive, in families receiving an annual income in excess of \$3,000 per annum from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act bears to the total number of such children in all the States. For the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall determine the number of children aged three to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than \$3,000 on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a State are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary shall determine from data which shall be supplied by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of \$3,000 per annum from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, on the basis of the latest calendar or fiscal year data, whichever is later.

"(c) State educational agencies, or the Secretary as provided for under sections 10 and 13(d) of this Act, shall use the funds authorized in this section to provide meals to children whose parents or guardians do not have the financial ability to provide for the adequate nutrition of the children and to children determined by local officials as in need of improved nutrition. Such funds may be used to finance such children's participation in a nonprofit food service program under this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to assist in financing the purchase or rental of equipment needed to operate such programs; and not to exceed an amount equal to 2 per centum of the total funds to be used for the purposes of this section in any fiscal year may be used in such fiscal year to defray part of the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture and of the States in carrying out this section.

"(d) The authority contained in this section is intended to supplement the authority and funds available for use under other sections of this Act and the Child Nutrition Act, except that not to exceed 5 per centum of the funds available to any State under this

section may be used for the purposes of section 13 of this Act.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue regulations for the operation of the program under this section.

"(f) The withholding of funds for and disbursement to nonprofit private schools will be effected in accordance with section 10 of this Act, exclusive of the matching provisions thereof.

"(g) The withholding of funds and disbursement to service institutions will be effected in accordance with section 13(d) of this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is a second demanded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11651 would amend the National School Lunch Act by adding a new section giving authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to use during the current fiscal year \$100 million from section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935—7 United States Code 612C—to improve the nutrition of needy children in schools, in day care facilities, and other organized activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes.

These funds would be in addition to the funds that have already been appropriated by the House and Senate in the Agriculture appropriation bill, H.R. 11612, the differences in which are yet to be resolved in conference.

The disposition of section 32 funds for the fiscal year 1970 as a result of the passage of H.R. 11612 and the passage of H.R. 11651 is reflected in the following table which I request be placed in the RECORD at this point:

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1970 (H.R. 11612)—
DISPOSITION OF SEC. 32 FUNDS

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1970 House	1970 Senate
Appropriation or estimate.....	+665,000	+665,000
Balance from prior years.....	+300,000	+300,000
Transfers to—		
(1) Child nutrition.....	-194,266	-194,266
(2) Special milk.....	-120,000	-120,000
(3) Agriculture research.....	-15,000	-15,000
(4) FAS.....	-3,117	-3,117
(5) Interior Department.....	-7,703	-7,703
Total available after transfers.....	+624,914	+724,914
Obligations.....	-444,914	-444,914
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year.....	+180,000	+300,000
H.R. 11651.....	-100,000	-100,000
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year.....	+80,000	+200,000

The total funds thus being made available in fiscal year 1970 as a result of the House passage of H.R. 11612 and H.R. 11651 for child feeding programs would be \$858,015,000, as reflected in the following table which I request be placed in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 11612 and H.R. 11651 fiscal year
1970 funds

[In thousands of dollars]

CHILD FEEDING PROGRAMS

Cash grants to States:	
School lunch (sec. 4).....	168,041
Special assistance (sec. 11).....	44,800
School breakfast.....	10,000
Nonfood assistance.....	10,000
State administrative.....	750
Nonschool food program.....	10,000
Special milk.....	120,000
Special section 32.....	89,000
H.R. 11651 section 32.....	100,000

Total cash to States..... 552,591

Commodities to States:	
School lunch (sec. 6).....	64,325
Section 32.....	90,411
Section 416.....	146,838

Total commodities..... 301,574

Federal operating expenses:	
School lunch.....	3,100
Nonschool feeding.....	750
Special milk.....	

Total operating expenses..... 3,850

Total, child feeding..... 858,015

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgent need for the passage of this legislation. It is quite evident that we have not provided sufficient funds to adequately provide for food services for needy schoolchildren throughout this Nation. Of the fifty-one and a quarter million children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, thirty-two and a half million do not have school lunch programs at the present time. Three and a quarter million of the children not now participating in the school lunch program need a free lunch. Approximately nineteen and a half million of those not now participating require a reduced price lunch.

In this regard, I would like to refer you to the hearings of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted on May 13, 1969, page 2481 and those that follow, which were reported on page 7 of House Report 91-379 that accompanies this bill.

The steps to be taken in the program's administration include payments to the school to permit it to acquire the food and the service equipment to be able to provide nutritious meals to children.

Funds are distributed among the States so as to focus on the low-income groups in the poor sections of the major metropolitan areas and in the rural areas of our country. It is very similar to the formula we have in title I of ESEA.

Three percent of the funds would be allotted among Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

In all of these areas that I have mentioned, many needs are in common—school buildings are old and lack food preservation and preparation facilities—local financial resources are extremely limited to expand school budgets to include food services.

To serve all the children not now being served we realize this bill would not

do the complete job. That would take some \$225 million, the best authorities estimate. But if we fail to make available the \$100 million which we propose to make available here we are not going to make any progress toward the solution of this pressing problem.

I recognize some will question this legislation because they have maintained that we would diminish the availability of section 32 funds and we would deplete the fund from the standpoint of some commodity which might need to be supported or might need to be purchased.

Here we are attempting to carry out, and I believe we are carrying out, the true intent of section 32 when it was originally enacted in 1935, by purchasing commodities. Many of the commodities are presently supported with a support price, and can be purchased for the needy children in this country.

Let me stress that the funds under this bill are spent in the local communities. I will say that 80 percent of the funding is spent in the local communities, and the other 20 percent, of course, is spent for commodities that are not perishable that can be distributed to the various school systems and stored in the warehouses.

I believe we should also make it perfectly clear that in many years since 1935 we have had a reduction of the carryover, and some years it has been as small as \$47 million, and \$73,724,000.

In addition to the \$300 million carryover, which was carried over this year from section 32 funds into fiscal year 1970, several years ago this House authorized \$500 million as the permanent appropriation to support section 32 purposes and section 32 commodities. We are not depleting this fund. We are really carrying out the true purposes of this fund. On any occasion the Committee on Appropriations can take action if there is an emergency anywhere in the country without coming to the Congress for an authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that we would be taking \$100 million from Department of Agriculture's funds, whatever they may be? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. PERKINS. I said we were taking \$100 million from section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which this Chamber has done time and time again.

Mr. GROSS. And that is for the purpose of feeding children in the cities as well as elsewhere. Is that not true?

Mr. PERKINS. This is for the purpose of helping the most needy children with school lunches, in the cities as well as those in the rural areas.

Mr. GROSS. I just want the gentleman to emphasize for the benefit of a few Members here what is happening to this \$100 million; where it is being taken from and what it is being used for, so that they may have some comprehension of how this money is being used and that it will all be charged to the farmer.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who

has always supported educational and humanitarian legislation, and who is a great supporter of the school lunch program, that this \$100 million does not flow into normal channels. Fifty-four percent of the money Congress appropriates for school lunches goes to middle-class children—children from families whose income ranges from \$10,000 upward. In this particular instance all of the money goes to children in families with less than \$3,000 and it is distributed according to the various States on the basis of the number of children in families with less than \$3,000 a year compared to the total number in the country.

Mr. GROSS. But the money is being taken from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PERKINS. The Department of Agriculture now has the money available, and in my judgment this will be of tremendous assistance to our farmers because we are continuing to get rid of the surplus commodities, which was the real purpose of our enacting section 32 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says is true, but the primary purpose of this legislation is to help needy children. Is that not correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. The primary purpose here is to help needy children. And for no greater purpose could this money ever be expended, in my judgment, since we have this emergency in this country. And I feel that we would be derelict in our responsibility if we failed to do it.

I might observe that the Committee on Appropriations has utilized section 32 funds more this year than on previous occasions. However, what the Appropriations Committee did this year in H.R. 11612 was to take section 32 funds and substitute them for the direct appropriations that have been made in previous appropriation measures.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. If we pass this bill, as I hope we will today, we will provide authorization for the money which is derived from the section 32 program, to help needy children from families of less than \$3,000 income who do not now have a sufficient diet.

Even with a use of \$100 million for needy schoolchildren, there will still be enough section 32 funds available with which to acquire surplus commodities of all kinds from American farmers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of the past has been that there have not been sufficient programs to utilize surplus foods after they have been acquired. This bill will make certain that we utilize the production from our farms by increasing the consumption of needy schoolchildren.

We also have an authorization, in case this is a problem to anyone, an authorization under the Agricultural Act of 1956, section 205, for \$55 million. Therefore, if Department of Agriculture uses for other programs so much section 32 money that there is not enough to cover this \$100 million authorization, or if they

use this \$100 million but do not have sufficient section 32 funds to acquire surplus commodities to fulfill USDA commitments.

So, Mr. Speaker, if anyone is concerned that there might not be enough section 32 funds to purchase commodities such as the citrus fruit, turkey, pork, or any other commodities, you can rest assured that the \$500 million authorization which is law would permit a supplemental appropriation later on if needed. This bill will make certain that there will be an availability of an additional \$100 million for the use of needy children in the school lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization that we attempted last year and which went through the House, was in the sum of \$300 million. The authorization we are asking for this year is \$100 million. Therefore, we feel it is in the amount that can well be used and should be used and that we need the authorization in addition to that which is in the school lunch program at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this legislation at this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we should point out here that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has worked many long hours and days in trying to improve the school lunch programs of this country. The gentleman deserves much credit.

Mr. Speaker, in the food assistance program, in the child feeding programs in the schools, we are presently proposing to spend \$758,015,000 under the House bill that was passed, including the \$120 million that was put in the bill by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for the special milk program.

Mr. Speaker, since the other body has taken action on this and has approved an appropriation of \$722,015,000, I think we should make it clear here in the course of this debate that the \$100 million, if the House acts favorably and if this legislation is passed, that this \$100 million is intended in addition to what the Appropriations Committee conferees agree on.

We intend that this \$100 million extra will bring the total in the children's feeding program up to approximately \$850 million. We further intend that this \$100 million should be expended for the needy, the poorest, the most needy, where the demand is present and where we do not have school equipment in the estimated 7,000 or 8,000 schools in this country; am I correct in that statement?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, another legislative milestone in our continuing program to bring the benefits of improved nutrition to our economically disadvantaged children.

Until our program has reached every

hungry child in America and given him, through proper nutrition, the opportunity to achieve his maximum potential in life, our task is incomplete. H.R. 11651, a 1-year emergency measure, would aid the needy children of our Nation who are not being reached by the programs authorized by the school lunch program and the Child Nutrition Act.

Nutrition-deficient children in schools, in day-care facilities, and in other organized activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes, are the intended beneficiaries of this emergency program. These children, between the ages of 3 and 17, would be provided meals free of charge or at a reduced price. These children must be given, through the utilization of our available national resources, the needed assistance to overcome the handicap of inadequate nutrition.

Our national resources in this instance consist of \$100 million derived from customs receipts. The legislation before us would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use that sum during the current fiscal year to carry out its purposes.

As we marvel at the dramatic achievement of the Apollo 11 mission and continue to offer our prayers for the safe return of its crew, it is not too remote to believe that some of the leaders of America's epic programs of the future, whether in space or on this earth, may well come from the ranks of the disadvantaged children. H.R. 11651 is designed to aid. Irrespective of such possibility, however, by improving the nutrition of these needy children, America will have made an infinitely wise investment in its own future.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11651 deserves our unanimous vote.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have one concern, and I am asking these questions for the purpose of securing information.

Are section 32 funds available to the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of grain products?

For example, wheat, as the gentleman well knows, out in the Midwest we are hurting with the price support of \$1.25 for wheat, and after transportation and storage charges it is down to \$1.15.

Would taking \$100 million away from section 32 funds destroy any opportunity for the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the price support on wheat for fiscal year 1970?

Mr. QUIE. No. This would not have anything to do with it. The Secretary of Agriculture would still be able to raise the price support on wheat in 1970 under the law.

Mr. DENNEY. That would be under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or under what they call title II funds, I believe; is that where it comes in?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. In the past there has been very little of the money used for grains. This has been used mostly for the perishable commodities. For instance, \$10 million was used in 1968 for grains of all kinds. Not just wheat, but all kinds of grain.

Mr. DENNEY. Out of the section 32 funds?

Mr. QUIE. Out of the section 32 funds.

Mr. DENNEY. But do I understand the gentleman to say that, taking the \$100 million out of the school lunch fund would not affect the Secretary of Agriculture's right to raise the price support on wheat?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DENNEY. Because there would be other funds available?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, which I consider to be paramount in importance to many of our Nation's children. H.R. 11651 authorizes the expenditure of section 32 funds for free or reduced priced meals to needy children.

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935—7 U.S.C. 612C—revenues are derived from imports of foreign agricultural products and are returned annually to the Treasury. Since 1959, approximately \$1 billion has reverted to the Treasury from section 32 funds. The House of Representatives recognized the opportunity to utilize these funds in a meaningful fashion when we approved last year a measure quite similar to that which we are considering here today. Although no further action was taken on that measure by the Senate, enough support was engendered for the bill's provisions that \$45 million was appropriated by Congress to meet the nutritional requirements of disadvantaged children.

The Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings on food service programs in an effort to cover thoroughly all aspects of food distribution, particularly the roles played by all levels of government in the administration of assistance programs for needy persons. During these hearings some startling facts were revealed with respect to the continuing lack of coverage by our food assistance programs. The committee report discloses the following facts:

First. More than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches.

Second. More than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services.

Third. Almost 3,000,000 economically deprived children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program.

Fourth. As many as three-quarters of a million children coming from large families whose incomes are in excess of \$3,000 per annum are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Considerable attention has been given in recent months to the problems of malnutrition and some valuable recommendations have been proposed for effectively feeding the hungry. This discussion is most helpful toward establishing a meaningful nutritional assistance program for the economically deprived. However, it must be remembered that passage of H.R. 11651 by Congress will not obviate the need for a comprehensive and workable program for feeding the

poor. The legislation we are considering today is desperately needed. It demands our unqualified support.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN).

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 11651, legislation which would provide an additional \$100 million for free and reduced-price lunches for children from low-income families.

This is one of very few bills to come before the House which allocates fiscal resources to those who need them most. It is an irony that with millions of hungry children in America, we have hunger programs like the special milk program which allocates less than 7 percent of their funds to poor children and that attempts by myself and others to redirect such programs fall on deaf ears.

The Committee on Education and Labor under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) has demonstrated that a committee of Congress can grasp the urgency with which hunger and malnutrition must be faced in this country.

I can only hope that the Agriculture Committee can come to a similar comprehension of this sense of urgency and report out immediately the Senate passed bill to double fiscal 1970 funding for the food-stamp program without waiting for redundant hearings.

Unfortunately, as good as this legislation is, it does not begin to meet the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

If the entire \$100 million went just to the city of New York, it would not be capable of taking care of the needs of the city's 4.24 million schoolchildren.

What is needed is a Federal payment of 100 percent of the cost of free lunches to the Nation's poor.

Nor are State governments like New York State making such a contribution. In my own State of New York, Rockefeller has demonstrated a dramatic lack of concern for the hungry schoolchildren not only by the cutting of funds for the school lunch program on the premise that welfare money was available to pay for the cost of poor children's lunch, but by then turning right around and cutting the welfare budget for food as well.

We cannot rely on the Rockefellers and Republican State legislators to do anything about child hunger, just like you cannot rely on this administration in Washington to do anything in this area.

You don't see the administration actively supporting the legislation before us today. The administration is more concerned about balancing the budget than about feeding poor starving kids. Where Johnson asked for \$20 million increase in school nutrition funding for fiscal 1970, an amount which was barely adequate, Nixon cut back even that request \$5 million.

Nixon only came out with his May statement to the Congress on hunger after public indignation became too much to bear, and the daily press accounts of the administration in fighting

on hunger became too embarrassing. Unfortunately, that statement turned out to be little more than rhetoric for it has not been translated into any action.

As I have pointed out in the past, there is much Nixon could have done to achieve the objectives he set down in his May speech to Congress on hunger with the resources and funding he had.

My attempts to prod the Nixon administration to spend the \$30 million in food-stamp money it had available at end of fiscal 1969, and the \$110 million in free food money were of no avail. About all either did was bring excuses from the administration on why it could not act and result in a political coverup with the Department of Agriculture hiding the \$110 million in bookkeeping gymnastics to prevent the public from knowing what they had done.

As I said 2 months ago when I introduced the Food Stamp Reform Act, the only way that progress is going to be achieved in this field is for the Congress, together with the American people, to act, ignoring the administration. This bill is a good example of a committee doing exactly that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have some hesitation in trying to comment on another committee's bills, and I very seldom do it.

But I do believe this is a bill that the Nation can afford. I believe the strength of our Nation's future lies in the children of today. The facts are incontrovertible that there is a need for these hot lunches in many parts of our Nation. The program will be in the hands of the local people. Certainly, if we can afford some of the expenditures we are affording, we can afford to feed needy and hungry children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill. I want to compliment the majority and the minority members of this committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

I trust that we will look at this in terms of adding to our national assets and that we will all support this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California often speaks about the gross national product.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed the other day that the gross national product is at the annual rate of \$925 billion.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is pretty high.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that there are any so-called needy children in this country under the circumstances. How does the gentleman account for a \$925 billion annual gross national product and needy children?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is very simple. I would point out to the gentleman the fact that you and I get \$42,500 a year and a lot of people in these United States do not get that.

This gross national product is not distributed as well as we should like to see it distributed. I think if it was distributed

in some areas of our country, where these pockets of poverty exist, then we would not have the problem of hungry children before us today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows, I think, that the yardstick for measurement of the economic well-being of this country does not repose in any gross national product figures. I maintain that the gross national product and the basis on which it is arrived at is as phoney as a \$13 bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would be glad to take an hour someday to talk on that matter with the gentleman, but it is not under discussion so far as this bill is concerned so far as I know.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I would not want the remarks of the gentleman from New York to pass without some comment.

In the past, the Speaker of this House has joined with the majority of the Members of the Congress in well-intentioned programs to solve the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Further, we have just heard some comments about the gross national product and the seeming wealth of the country, and at the same time admitting a need to take care of individuals who are not sharing in the wealth of the Nation.

I know that this administration is interested not in grandiose public-relation types of programs, but in programs which will yield results. We know that the effort has been made, and yet we also know that somehow the money that the Congress has appropriated through the years has not filtered to those people who really need it. We need a good, firm, effective plan, not just money, but a definite planned program to make sure that this money does get to the places where it is needed.

I assure the gentleman from New York that this administration is deeply concerned about solving this problem which has existed for too long in the United States.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the gentleman. But those are facts, and the facts remain that \$140 million that the head of the Department of Agriculture had for free food programs and for food stamps was returned to the Treasury, despite the fact that there is this great need among those who need food, and the fact that I wrote to him on two occasions requesting that that money be distributed among the various States for the purpose of distributing food stamps and free food. Certainly intentions are governed by facts, and I have given you facts.

Mr. KYL. I will reiterate to the gentleman this obvious fact: We have appropriated money for years in this program. We have had money available. In my own State and in the gentleman's State, in spite of the good intentions of the Congress, this money has not gone where

it should go. That fact is also obvious. We need not only money, but also a plan to get the money to where it should go.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to say to the gentleman that, so far as turning money back to the Treasury is concerned, at the close of the fiscal year 1968 we saw \$229,038,099 turned back to the Treasury. It is expected that there will be no money turned back to the Treasury for the fiscal year 1969. It is so close to the end of the fiscal year we cannot tell exactly, but it looks like there will be none returned, and it will be used for the purposes intended in 1969. Secretary Hardin is feeding needy people rather than turning money back to the Treasury.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) for an observation.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the two gentlemen from Iowa, one asking why there should be hungry children if our gross national product is so high, and the other saying that it is very difficult to devise a program to feed hungry children.

I watched that moon shot last night. I saw Americans on the moon, and I saw television beamed from the moon to the earth. I also witnessed the President speaking on the telephone from earth to moon.

I think if we had the same sense of commitment to feed hungry children as we do to go to the moon, there would not be a starving person in the United States of America today.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the remarks made by the able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that the gross national product was not the criterion of the social conditions of this country. I therefore presume to call attention to a bill which has been introduced in the other body by the able Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, and I in this body, setting up a Council of Social Advisers in the executive department and providing for an annual social report by the President and a joint committee of the House and Senate upon such report, all analogous to the Full Employment Act of 1946, setting up a Council of Economic Advisers in the White House, a Presidential Economic Report, and a Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report in the Congress. Such legislation would inform the Congress and the country as to what the social conditions of our people are throughout the land.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 11651. In the midst of the affluence of this country it is a sobering fact that too many of our children are not adequately fed.

The purpose of this bill is to remedy that defect. Certainly in a time when so much of our resources are expended in matters that have no connection with human concerns it is appropriate that we should take this modest step to guarantee the present health of our children, and as a result greater national health for our country.

This bill will improve the nutrition of needy children in schools, day-care facilities, and other organized activities where children are brought together away from their homes. This program will reach children who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support.

This is a worthwhile objective and I

hope that the House will support this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, before this bill goes to the other body I believe we should make it clear that in financing the school lunch programs for fiscal year 1970—H.R. 11612—the House did not make direct appropriations in all cases here and decided to finance a larger portion of the regular school lunch program as well as other child feeding programs out of section 32 funds.

I think that this is illustrated by examination of the following two tables. The first table reflects the increased use of section 32 as a source of funding for child feeding programs and the second table indicates that the total funds being made available to child feeding programs from direct appropriations and from section 32 transfers does not indicate an appreciable increase for a comparable period.

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FROM SECTION 32 FUNDS

Item	1968	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Appropriation or estimate.....	\$578,911,603	\$596,645,658	\$665,000,000
Balance available from prior years.....	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000
Recovery of prior years obligations.....	20,077		
Unobligated balance of research funds returned from Agricultural Research Service.....	317,305		
Transfers to—			
Child nutrition programs.....	-45,000,000	-64,325,000	-194,266,000
Special milk program.....	-104,000,000	-104,000,000	-120,000,000
Agricultural Research Service.....	-15,000,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	-3,117,000	-3,117,000	-3,117,000
Interior Department.....	-7,443,592	-7,412,775	-7,703,000
H.R. 11651.....			-100,000,000
Total available after transfers.....	704,688,393	702,790,883	524,914,000
Obligations.....	175,649,394	402,790,883	444,914,000
Unobligated balance.....	229,038,999		
Unobligated balance carried forward to subsequent year.....	300,000,000	300,000,000	80,000,000

FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS 1969 AND ESTIMATES FOR 1970

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1969, estimated	1970 revised budget	House bill	Senate committee
A. Child feeding programs:				
1. Cash grants to States:				
(a) School lunch (sec. 4).....	\$162,041	\$168,041	\$168,041	\$168,041
(b) Special assistance (sec. 11).....	10,000	44,800	44,800	44,800
(c) School breakfast.....	3,500	10,000	10,000	10,000
(d) Nonfood assistance.....	750	10,000	10,000	10,000
(e) State administrative.....	750	750	750	750
(f) Nonschool food program.....	5,700	10,000	10,000	
(g) Special milk.....	103,314		119,300	83,319
(h) Special sec. 32.....	43,941	89,000	89,000	89,000
Total, cash to States.....	330,046	332,591	451,891	415,910
2. Commodities to States:				
School lunch (sec. 6).....	64,325	64,325	64,325	64,325
Sec. 32.....	80,500	90,411	90,411	90,411
Sec. 416.....	144,872	146,838	146,838	146,838
Total, commodities.....	289,697	301,574	301,574	301,574
3. Federal operating expenses:				
School lunch.....	2,161	3,100	3,100	3,100
Nonschool feeding.....	500	750	750	750
Special milk.....	681		700	681
Total, operating expenses.....	3,342	3,850	4,550	4,531
Total, child feeding.....	623,085	638,015	758,015	722,015

In fiscal year 1969, transfers from section 32 funds to child feeding programs amounted to approximately \$194 million. This year, in the House passed H.R. 11612, they amounted to \$340 million but the total funds being made available from both sources—section 32 and direct appropriations—increased by less than \$15 million.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the gentleman if he agrees with that statement.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute in order to say to the chairman of the committee that I agree with the figures, and that there was a shift from direct appropriations to the use of sec-

tion 32 in the school lunch program and the special feeding program.

As I said earlier, we have plenty of authorization for additional appropriations if programs funded under section 32 go over the amount annually accumulated.

Also, in closing, I would say that when people on the other side of the aisle chastise this administration for not giving attention to the needs of hungry people, they are surely missing the boat, because the requests we have seen in the President's messages, sent to Congress, to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and Labor, are greater than we have ever seen before. This shows that this administration is not only committed to continue the space race which was begun some years ago but also it is committed to put its money where its mouth was on feeding needy people. President Nixon's request to double funds for needy people cannot be turned into some claim of callous attitude just for partisan purposes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years we have witnessed the step-by-step awakening of the American people to a sobering set of circumstances prevailing in their country: the existence of hunger and widespread malnutrition. In 1967, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy was in the vanguard of those who saw, and were profoundly dismayed by, the existence of hunger. In a land where many farmers are paid not to grow food, in a land which gives generously of its vast quantity of surplus food to less fortunate nations, the discovery of hunger and malnutrition seems at first an impossibility. Skepticism and doubt prevailed in the beginning but were gradually erased by periodic revelations of more and worse conditions of severe malnutrition and hunger. Thus, in June of 1967 a team of dedicated doctors reported to the Field Foundation and wrote in a shocked and angry tone about hunger among the children of Mississippi:

We saw children who are hungry and who are sick—children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life and sickness, in many forms, an inevitability. We do not want to quibble over words, but "malnutrition" is not quite what we found; the boys and girls we saw were hungry—weak, in pain, sick; their lives are being shortened; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what "starvation" means.

In the reports that followed in 1968, it was again always the children who seemed to suffer most from lack of enough of the right foods; it was also the children who understood least what was happening to them.

The report by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States maintained that children in poverty areas were found to be shorter and smaller than the national norm, an observation supported by the preliminary results of the national nutrition survey currently being conducted by the U.S. Public Health Service. Whenever cases of the extreme protein and caloric deficiency diseases of kwashiorkor

kor and marasmus are reported, children are always the victims. Perhaps worse than the bodily damage done to children by hunger and malnutrition is the harm that may be done to their minds. There is increasing evidence to show that a lack of protein in the diet of babies and young children may lead to irreversible brain damage. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has this year heard disturbing testimony on this question as it has on so many other matters concerning hunger and malnutrition and American children.

Since 1946 the Federal Government has been attempting to assure American children of good nutrition, primarily through the school lunch program, but it is not enough. Last year we learned what many people had suspected for a long time: the school lunch program is not doing the job of feeding those children most in need of nutritious food, the children of poverty. A study was made of the program by five prestigious women's groups and their findings were published in a report, "Their Daily Bread":

The most cherished myth about the National School Lunch Program is that no child who really needs a lunch is allowed to go hungry.

We say flatly that this is not so. By conservative estimates, the odds are three to one against his getting a free lunch. There are six million school-age children in this country from families at the rock-bottom of poverty—whose parents earn less than \$2,000 a year and/or are receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). But fewer than two million children receive free or reduced price lunches in the National School Lunch Program.

The authors of "Their Daily Bread" and the others who have written about this intolerable situation have all recommended the same remedy: increased funds to insure that needy children are fed. H.R. 11651—the legislation now before us—is a bill that will do just that. It amends the National School Lunch Act to authorize the use of \$100 million in section 32 funds in fiscal 1970 to provide meals for children whose families earn less than \$3,000 a year or are on AFDC.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the awakening of the American people is now complete and that the need for such legislation as H.R. 11651 is now abundantly evident. I personally have every faith in the generosity and the clear-sightedness of my fellow citizens; I believe that once they are aware of the existence of wrongs, the American people want to right them if they possibly can. They—and we, as their Representatives in Congress—can right the grievous wrong being done to so many of America's children.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my support to the amendment to the National School Lunch Act.

In spite of our belief in an affluent America, there are still millions of needy schoolchildren who begin and end each day hungry, who suffer from constant malnutrition which will affect them the rest of their lives.

America enjoys a continuing and rapidly expanding technology. As we de-

velop new means of producing goods, as our requirements for the goods themselves change, so do our labor requirements. It has become apparent that American workers increasingly require an adequate education in order to earn a decent living. Those who suffer most from rapid changes in technology are the children of the unskilled and the single skilled. When parents are thrown out of work or forced to take more menial jobs because they lack the requisite skills, the amount of food available in the home naturally dwindles.

As a result, in the North and in the South, children enter into the vicious cycle of hunger and ignorance. A child who is hungry cannot learn. And a child who grows up hungry has neither the strength nor the tools to provide for himself and become a productive citizen. And thus his children too enter into the vicious cycle.

A child's most crucial development years are his earliest. Malnutrition in his youngest years prevents physical development of his brain as well as his body. I am told that by the age of 3 years a child's brain achieves 80 percent of its adult weight. From the time of conception through the child's early years, failure of the brain to receive adequate and proper nutrition will result in drastic failure of brain growth which cannot be made up in later years. The result is permanent brain damage or, at best, congenital ignorance. And it is a simple fact of life, for which we need no expert testimony, that a child who has his mind on his belly will not be attentive to his lessons.

Failure to provide adequate nutrition to a child will result in a greater likelihood of chronic adult illness. In order to be productive a man must be healthy. If a child spends the first 15 years of his life with inadequate nutrition to develop his body and withstand disease it follows that as an adult his productivity will be lessened and continuously interrupted by sickness and disease.

This Nation cannot afford the loss of effectiveness or productivity of its children. The future of any nation is dependent on the physical and intellectual strength of its next generations. If today's children are hungry, tomorrow's America is the loser.

This Nation presently spends millions of dollars for the purpose of not growing crops. If we can afford to subsidize our farmers for not growing food, then we can certainly afford to make food available to hungry schoolchildren.

I realize that we presently have programs which are supposed to provide nutritional assistance to the hungry. It is apparent, however, that these programs are not reaching the people for which they were intended. I also understand that these programs are presently under study in an effort to make them more effective. In the meantime, it is necessary to fill in the gap between now and some future date when the present programs can be made more effective. I urge my colleagues to give their support to this emergency measure.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11651, a bill for temporary

emergency assistance to provide nutritious meals to needy children.

The need for this type of legislation has long been recognized by the House. Last year we passed a similar measure, H.R. 17872, under suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds majority vote. No further action was taken on that measure in the Senate although the bill stimulated the appropriation of \$45 million to be distributed to meet the nutritional needs of children along the guidelines set forth in H.R. 17872.

The bill before us today would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use, during the current fiscal year 1970, \$100 million from section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, to provide free or reduced price breakfasts or lunches to needy children.

Section 32 revenues are derived from imports of foreign agricultural products, and it is fitting that funds from this source be used to provide food for our needy children. The Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, was informed that more than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches. More than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services. Equally startling, almost 3 million economically deprived children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program.

In addition to helping these children, the bill would assist as many as three quarters of a million children from large families whose incomes are in excess of \$3,000 but who are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Overall, there are an estimated 32.5 million children who do not participate in the school lunch program. Less than 10 million of them could be expected to be able to afford a full price lunch at school. I would favor an appropriation to bring the program within reach of all children who need either free or subsidized lunches, but the cost of including all 32.5 million children would be approximately \$1.3 billion.

If we merely provided an entirely free lunch for the 3,250,000 extremely needy children who are not participating in any school lunch program, the cost would be \$225 million. I think that these figures show the magnitude of the task before us, and document the need for the \$100 million we are requesting. Despite all of the government programs in this field, the amount we are seeking today will not meet the need.

The authority conferred by the bill is specifically to provide food services to children in addition to the support now provided under the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutritional Act. The major focus of the program would be to reach those children in schools and organized children's activities who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support for whatever reason.

It is intolerable for this affluent nation to continue neglecting the basic nutrition needs of millions of schoolchildren. There are insufficient funds available from section 32 duties on imported agricultural products to meet the entire

deficiency, but I urge approval of this measure to bring some relief and benefit to our hungry children.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today our country—along with the entire world—basks in the sun of a scientific and technological achievement, until now only a dream for mankind. Two brave and talented human beings have landed on the surface of the moon, placed there by an astounding display of pure research and applied science management and teamwork. It is an achievement which has moral and social implications of equal importance.

While the drama focuses on the activities of the men in space, equally dramatic is the effort that put them there. The effort cost \$24 billion, and, at its peak, top Apollo project directors coordinated and managed the work of 20,000 companies employing 420,000 people.

Just as I am deeply moved by this achievement, I am equally struck by the irony through which we find ourselves here today to consider legislation to provide 3 million needy children with breakfasts and lunches which they urgently need and currently do not have.

Why is it that we can make a national commitment to put a man on the moon and organize an effort to decipher the mysteries of the universe, while we have not as yet made a similar total commitment to eliminate hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty in America?

We have developed a metallic skin for the space capsule which enables it to move our astronauts in and out of varying earthly, space, and lunar environments in complete safety, resisting temperatures as high as 240 degrees above and below freezing, without damage to the space capsule or threat to the physical well-being of the extraordinary human beings who guide it.

Why is it we cannot devise the metals—the packaging materials for the foods and liquids we consume—which will commence a process of slow disintegration when exposed to the elements after being used. Today the streets of our cities are littered with soda bottles, beer cans, and plastic containers in ever-increasing volume. We have yet to develop the methodology for their removal; our cities are threatened with inundation from garbage because we have ignored the problems of solid waste disposal.

We have solved the problem of disposing of the astronauts' waste products by recycling them into washing, and then drinking water, and of bringing our astronauts back from the moon without bringing bacteria which will contaminate the earth. Yet we continue to poison and pollute the earth's air, land, and water at rapid rates. We have yet to organize comparable crash programs to undertake the immense task of purifying our rivers, air, and land of the various kinds of human and industrial waste and pollutants which threaten to make our own planet unlivable.

The effort in space demonstrates what dedicated Americans can achieve when they establish priority objectives.

Why can we not establish our domestic goals here on planet earth and de-

vote the same type of technological genius and development know-how to preserving the quality of life on earth, as we have done to establish the possibility of life beyond it.

The Apollo effort indicates far more than our demonstrated capacity to produce the ultimate in death-dealing weaponry. It demonstrates what we could do in the cause of peace and plenty. We can solve the problem of pollution and poverty and overpopulation if only we establish the kind of priorities for these urgent problems which we now give to our space program and to programs designed to increase our capacity for death and destruction.

As a barebones start, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 11651.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will speedily and resoundingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 11651, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use, during this fiscal year, \$100 million to provide free or reduced breakfasts or lunches to needy children.

The specific intent of this bill is to provide essential nutritional services to extremely needy children who are not now benefiting from Federal food service support programs. It would seem obvious that the most effective and practical way of providing these services would be, as the bill directs, through activities in which children are concentrated away from their homes, such as a preschool program or a day-care facility. In other words, the administrative resources and units, through which these programs can be brought to the children, would be already in existence so that the program would be projected with a maximum of economic operation and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, to the credit of this country and this Government, a great deal has already been accomplished toward overcoming the very serious problem of child malnutrition but the absolute necessity to take this further wholesome step is evidenced by the authoritative testimony disclosed in committee hearings that: More than 4½ million needy children, ages 5 through 17, are not receiving free or reduced price lunches; more than 6,600 schools in economically needy areas are without food services; almost 9 million economically disadvantaged children, ages 5 through 17, in need of a school breakfast do not have access to such a program; and as many as three-quarters of a million children coming from large families whose incomes are less than \$3,000 per annum are estimated to need subsidized school food services.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed impressive testimony to inspire our actions and I am sure all Members of this House would unite in agreeing there is no reason at all why any child, or indeed adult, should go hungry in this land of plenty. I am certain that all of us would further agree that a well-nourished child learns better, is healthier, has greater energy, is better dispositioned, and is bound to become a better mature citizen.

Mr. Speaker, over these past several months there has been a great deal of talk about and attention given to the subject of priorities in spending. It is dif-

ficult, indeed, to think of anything that would have a higher call upon such priority than a needy American child. Unquestionably, this bill represents a prudent priority investment in the future of America and I most earnestly urge my colleagues to promptly and overwhelmingly approve it in the national interest.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 11651, concerned with providing adequate nutrition to needy children. The need for this legislation is obvious. Poor performance in school is known to be associated with the lack of a proper diet. Nutritional differences detract from a child's attitude, desire, and capability to learn. Despite the fact that we have a National School Lunch Act, better than 4.5 million of the needy children in America are not receiving free lunch.

This legislation is certainly one of top priority in the consideration of our national needs.

Even though the suburbs in the Eighth District of Maryland are among the most prosperous in the Nation, we have pockets of poverty and there is a real need among some of the schoolchildren. Last spring, in Montgomery County, I found that some of our needy children were not receiving free lunches.

The Montgomery County School Board has taken steps to remedy this condition, but I feel that it illustrates a very important point—if we are going to aid in diminishing this nutritional gap through the school lunch program, we are not only going to need the necessary funds, but, in addition, we must have cooperation at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the bill H.R. 11651 which would amend the National School Lunch Act by adding a new section to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to use \$100 million from section 32 of the Agriculture Act of August 24, 1935, to improve the nutrition of needy children. The program would be administered through schools, day-care facilities, and other organized centers and activities where children are concentrated away from their family residences. The authority prescribed in this bill is, according to the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, specifically "to provide food services to children in addition to the food service support now being provided under the provisions of the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutritional Act"—committee report on H.R. 11651, page 2.

The authority in this bill will enable the Department of Agriculture to reach more children who are in need of nutritional assistance but who are not now benefiting from other Federal food service programs. Unfortunately, the amount of \$100 million will reach less than 50 percent of the 3.25 million children who need free lunches. Approximately 32.5 million children are not now participating in Federal school lunch programs. Of these 32.5 million children, approximately 3.25 million are estimated by the Department of Agriculture to need free lunches. In addition, over 19 million children are estimated to need reduced price lunches.

Despite the fact that millions of children in need of free or reduced price lunches are not receiving food support from the Federal Government, the appropriations contained in the fiscal year 1970 budget for Federal child feeding programs are only marginally greater than those for fiscal year 1969. President Johnson's budget requested \$643,715,000 for fiscal year 1970 for food support programs for children, only a little over \$20 million more than the \$623,085,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1969. President Nixon's revised budget request reduces this small increase still further to \$638,015,000.

Since the funds recommended for child feeding programs in fiscal year 1970 are only slightly greater than was expended in fiscal year 1969, it is clear that these programs will be unable to reach the 22.25 million children who need free or reduced price lunches but are not now receiving them. Therefore it is essential that additional funds be provided.

The \$100 million authorized in H.R. 11651 will be drawn from section 32 funds of the Agriculture Act of August 24, 1935, from which, since 1959, approximately \$1 billion has been returned to the Treasury. Hence the expenditure authorized by H.R. 11651 would not derive from funds appropriated by Congress for the regular operation of the School Lunch Act.

While it is important that the House approve the legislation before us today, we should not deceive ourselves that the funds authorized in H.R. 11651 are sufficient to provide for the nutritional needs of needy school-age children. According to the committee report on this bill, approximately \$255.5 million would be necessary in order to assure a free lunch to the 3.25 million most needy children not now receiving Federal nutritional support. Thus, the \$100 million authorization contained in this bill will not even meet the needs of half of the most needy children. The cost of feeding all school-age children who currently do not participate in Federal school lunch program, it is estimated, would be over \$1 billion, or more than 10 times the amount authorized in H.R. 11651.

The House should not, then, be content merely to approve the bill before us today. For the \$100 million in additional funds authorized in H.R. 11651 still falls far below the \$255.5 million which the Committee on Education and Labor has estimated is required to provide free lunches for only the most needy 3.25 million children not now participating in other school lunch programs. Hence, there is also a need to increase appropriations for other child feeding programs from the levels recommended in the revised budget of the administration for fiscal year 1970.

Yesterday, the Nation witnessed the historic and dramatic landing of Apollo 11 on the moon. The technological achievement represented by that landing is indeed cause for immense national pride. But we would not forget that the achievements of the Apollo program were extremely costly—at least \$24 billion. The appropriations which NASA received for that effort did not cover part of the costs of a moon landing; for both NASA and

Congress recognized that partial appropriations would not get the job done.

With full support, the Apollo program is achieving, in spectacular fashion, the goals formulated for it. Congress must now recognize that if we are to achieve comparable results in solving the unmet domestic needs of our society, programs designed to meet those needs must also receive full support and attention. So long as Congress continues to appropriate only half the amount of money needed to solve urgent problems here at home, we will never achieve results comparable to the success in space.

For hundreds of years, men have dreamed of reaching the moon. That those dreams were fulfilled yesterday represents an enormous achievement for the United States. But the dream of abolishing hunger and malnutrition is far older than the dream of reaching the moon. The fact that we have as yet failed to achieve that dream is not, as Apollo 11 demonstrates, a failure of technical know-how. It is rather a failure of will. We have reached the moon. It is now time for Congress to make it clear that the abolition of hunger and malnutrition must take priority.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11651.

The question was taken.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 5, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—352

Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Cramer
Adair	Broyhill, N.C.	Daddario
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Va.
Albert	Buchanan	Daniels, N.J.
Anderson, Calif.	Burke, Fla.	Dawson
Anderson, Ill.	Burke, Mass.	de la Garza
Andrews, Ala.	Burleson, Tex.	Dellenback
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burlison, Mo.	Denney
Annunzio	Burton, Calif.	Dennis
Arends	Burton, Utah	Derwinski
Aspinall	Bush	Devine
Ayres	Button	Dickinson
Baring	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	Donohue
Belcher	Cabell	Dorn
Bell, Calif.	Caffery	Dowdy
Bennett	Cahill	Downing
Betts	Carter	Dulski
Bevill	Cederberg	Duncan
Blaggi	Celler	Eckhardt
Blester	Chamberlain	Edmondson
Bingham	Chappell	Edwards, Calif.
Blackburn	Chisholm	Edwards, La.
Blanton	Clancy	Ellberg
Blatnik	Clark	Erlenborn
Boggs	Clausen	Esch
Boland	Don H.	Eshleman
Bolling	Clawson, Del.	Evans, Colo.
Bow	Clay	Fallon
Brademas	Cleveland	Farbstein
Brasco	Cohelan	Fascell
Brinkley	Collier	Feighan
Brooks	Collins	Fish
Broomfield	Colmer	Fisher
Brotzman	Conable	Flowers
Brown, Calif.	Conte	Foley
Brown, Mich.	Conyers	Ford
	Corbett	William D.
	Corman	Foreman
	Coughlin	Fountain

Fraser	McClure	Roberts
Frellinghuysen	McCulloch	Robison
Frey	McDade	Rodino
Friedel	McDonald, Mich.	Rogers, Colo.
Fulton, Pa.	McEwen	Rogers, Fla.
Fulton, Tenn.	McFall	Ronan
Fuqua	McKneally	Rooney, N.Y.
Galifianakis	McMillan	Rooney, Pa.
Garmatz	Macdonald, Mass.	Rosenthal
Gettys	MacGregor	Rostenkowski
Gilmo	Madden	Roth
Gibbons	Mahon	Roybal
Gilbert	Mailliard	Ruth
Gonzalez	Mann	Ryan
Goodling	Marsh	St. Onge
Gray	Martin	Satterfield
Green, Pa.	Mathias	Saylor
Griffin	Matsunaga	Schadeberg
Griffiths	Mayne	Scherle
Grover	Meeds	Scheuer
Gubser	Melcher	Schneebeli
Gude	Meskill	Schwengel
Hagan	Mikva	Scott
Haley	Miller, Ohio	Shriver
Hamilton	Minis	Sikes
Hammer-schmidt	Minish	Skubitz
Hanna	Mink	Slack
Hansen, Idaho	Mize	Smith, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.	Mizell	Smith, Iowa
Harsha	Mollohan	Smith, N.Y.
Harvey	Monagan	Springer
Hastings	Moorhead	Stafford
Hathaway	Morgan	Staggers
Hawkins	Morse	Stanton
Hays	Morton	Steed
Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher	Steiger, Ariz.
Heckler, Mass.	Moss	Steiger, Wis.
Helstoski	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.	Stokes
Hogan	Myers	Stratton
Hollifield	Natcher	Stubblefield
Horton	Nedzi	Sullivan
Hosmer	Nelsen	Symington
Hull	Nichols	Taft
Hungate	Nix	Taylor
Hunt	Obey	Thompson, Ga.
Hutchinson	O'Hara	Thompson, N.J.
Ichord	Olsen	Thompson, Wis.
Jarman	O'Neal, Ga.	Tierran
Joelson	O'Neill, Mass.	Udall
Johnson, Calif.	Ottiger	Ullman
Johnson, Pa.	Passman	Utt
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Van Deerlin
Jones, N.C.	Patten	Vander Jagt
Jones, Tenn.	Pelly	Vanik
Karsh	Pepper	Vigorito
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Waggonner
Kazen	Philbin	Watts
Keith	Pickle	Weicker
King	Pike	Whalen
Kleppe	Pirnie	White
Kluczynski	Podeil	Whitehurst
Koch	Poff	Whitten
Kuykendall	Pollock	Widnall
Kyl	Preyer, N.C.	Wiggins
Kyros	Price, Ill.	Williams
Landgrebe	Price, Tex.	Wilson
Landrum	Pryor, Ark.	Charles H.
Langen	Pucinski	Wold
Latta	Quie	Wolff
Leggett	Randall	Wright
Lennon	Rarick	Wyatt
Lloyd	Rees	Wydler
Long, La.	Reid, Ill.	Wyllie
Long, Md.	Reuss	Wyman
Lowenstein	Rhodes	Yates
Lujan	Riegle	Yatron
McClary	Rivers	Young
McCloskey		Zablocki
		Zwack

NAYS—5

Davis, Wis.	Hall	Poage
Gross	Montgomery	

NOT VOTING—75

Abbott	Edwards, Ala.	McCarthy
Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	May
Alexander	Findley	Michel
Anderson, Tenn.	Flood	Miller, Calif.
Ashbrook	Flynt	Minshall
Ashley	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski
Beall, Md.	Gallagher	Pettis
Berry	Gaydos	Powell
Brook	Goldwater	Purcell
Camp	Green, Oreg.	Quillen
Carey	Halpern	Rallsback
Casey	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Cowger	Hébert	Reifel
Culver	Henderson	Roudebush
Cunningham	Howard	Ruppe
Davis, Ga.	Jacobs	St Germain
Delaney	Jonas	Sandman
Dent	Kee	Sebellus
Diggs	Kirwan	Shipley
Dwyer	Lipscob	Sisk
	Lukens	Snyder

Stuckey	Waldie	Wilson, Bob
Talcott	Wampler	Winn
Teague, Calif.	Watkins	Zion
Teague, Tex.	Watson	
Tunney	Whalley	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Delaney with Mrs. May.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Flood with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Berry.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Wampler.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Pettis with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY EXTENSION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10987) to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(c) of the National Commission on Product Safety Act (Public Law 90-146; 81 Stat. 466) is amended by striking out "two years from the date of approval of this Joint Resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1970".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is rec-

ognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10987 extends the life of the National Commission on Product Safety from November 20, 1969, to June 30, 1970. This Commission was created by Public Law 90-146, a joint resolution approved November 20, 1967. It is a temporary commission and has a 2-year life which commenced on November 20, 1967.

Public Law 90-146 contained an authorization of funds to be appropriated of \$2 million. Of this sum, \$525,000 was actually appropriated in 1968 but by the time the Commissioners were actually sworn in and the Commission was funded, most of the first year of its 2-year life had passed.

H.R. 10987 will provide 7 additional months for the Commission to complete its work. No new authorization is sought.

H.R. 10987 has the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The extension is supported by the Commission itself, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and thus far I have heard of no opposition.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Product Safety was created by the 90th Congress to make an indepth study of strengths and shortcomings of Federal, State, and local efforts to protect citizens from the effects of hazardous substances. It was intended that the Commission would explore the state of the laws in effect at each level and the manner in which they were being implemented. It was also intended to discover where, if anywhere, there might exist barren spots in the coverage. The job was to take until November 1969 and then cease.

Due to circumstances which were by no stretch of the imagination any fault of the legislation, the appointment of the Commissioners was not accomplished until May 1968. Thereafter, the process of obtaining funds with which to carry out the assignment was not completed until October 1968. Consequently, one of the 2 years intended to complete the task was eaten up before it got off the ground.

Once in motion, the Commission got about its work diligently and effectively. In an interim report on children's toys it presented information which resulted in almost immediate action to improve the safeguards by amendment to the Hazardous Substances Act. That legislation is presently pending and should be before the House in the next week or two.

The committee listened to the Commissioners describe their activities and plans for completing the assignment. The effort seems to be well run and aimed at proper objectives. It is also clear, however, that a period of about 2 years is the required time in which to accomplish that which we decreed. To wind up the affairs of the Commission in November of this year would be wasteful of the effort already expended.

The purpose of this bill is merely to extend the life of the Commission for 7 additional months. That will end the project on June 30, 1970, which is still

3¼ months short of the original 2-year estimate for the work. The Commission feels, however, that it can render the kind of report we are looking for by that time. There is no need for additional appropriation authorizations.

I recommend the passage of H.R. 10987.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure and sense of duty to the Nation and to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania that I rise today to urge all my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 10987 and extend the life of the Commission on Product Safety so that it can complete its assigned tasks.

I have been quite impressed by the work that the Commission is doing in a variety of areas. Earlier this year, I sponsored H.R. 10012 which is identical to the bill we have before us today and H.R. 7509 which would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to include additional categories of hazards which are found primarily in toys so that our children will not suffer the loss of life and limb because of the propensity of some manufacturers to make and market toys which are fashionable but not safe. The latter bill was drafted by the Commission and demonstrates in one small way its worth.

The work which the Commission has done in identifying hazards in toys and other types of products, which are designed to be used by the general consumer public, argues quite forcefully for the legislation now being considered. Certainly I do not think that any parent would want his daughter to play with a toy stove that heats up to 660°, hotter than a home oven, or a soldering kit which heats up to 800° and involves the use of molten lead. It is through identifying these products and letting the public know of their hazard that the Commission has done its greatest work. Public disclosure of hazards has more often than not been the catalyst for manufacturers to either take these products off the market permanently or at least recall them to eliminate the hazards which the Commission has found.

Recently, members of the Commission staff were of invaluable assistance to me in demonstrating to the people of Philadelphia the various types of hazardous toys on the market. I had the opportunity to appear on television in the Philadelphia area and discuss the subject and, through the assistance of the Commission, I had not only the hazardous toys to demonstrate but also the tremendous expertise of a Commission staff member to assist me in bringing home the message to our viewers. I need not tell you what the people of Philadelphia, who might otherwise have purchased these toys and had their children injured by them, think of the work being done by the Commission.

In late 1967, the Congress put itself on record as being extremely concerned about the massive toll of thousands of deaths and millions of injuries in American households and we recommended a new human right—the right of the consumer to be protected against the

unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market. The joint resolution which established the National Commission on Product Safety directed it to "conduct a comprehensive study and to file a report with the Congress and the President. Indications are that this report will not be completed before the fall of 1970. But the main issues have already been brought out into the open by the series of hearings which the Commission has held since last October in New York, Boston, Washington, and Chicago. Basically the issue is whether manufacturers will continue to have exclusive power to set standards that apply to a vast majority of products—floor furnaces with grills that burn toddlers, toys that cut them, wringer washers that mangle hands, electric steam vaporizers that scald infants, power lawn mowers that throw stones, football helmets that do not prevent brain concussions, and appliances, toys, hospital diagnostic equipment, and charcoal lighters that electrocute.

If voluntary standards are not adequate, the hearings which the Commission has conducted have certainly raised the question of what is to replace them. The question has also been raised as to whether it is desirable or even practical for every product to be subjected to Government premarketing clearance for safety, as medicines have been since 1938.

At this point it certainly appears that it is absolutely essential that some changes be made. The development of comprehensive safety standards is the key to the problem of product safety. Clearly, the system of voluntary controls has been put on trial by the Commission. They have made us all aware that protection against avoidable hazards is not adequately provided by old doctrines and comforting presumptions. Caveat emptor did not protect children who were scalded when they tipped over a vaporizer and were burned. Neither did the seals of approval showing compliance with the voluntary standards of the Underwriters Laboratories, the Good Housekeeping Institute or Parents magazine. There was no protection in claims in ads and the instruction booklet that the device was "tip-proof" "practically fool-proof," and "safe." There also was no protection in the presumption that self-interest and brisk competition motivate manufacturers to produce safe products. We all know that stylishness and advertising commonly ring up more sales than safety.

Lawsuits—which can only compensate a victim, not prevent the marketing of unsafe products—are not an effective restraint. And, what about recall of products found to be defective?

We are all thankful when the Commission discloses that a product is unsafe and the manufacturer magnanimously agrees to pull it off the market and correct its faults. But, is this enough? I think it is not. While a lawsuit can bring relief in monetary terms to those of us who buy unsafe products and have accidents using them, this relief is only after the fact. Can anyone ever get a big enough cash settlement or

judgment to make up, for example, for the loss of a child's leg or eye?

The cost of consulting an expert witness runs from about \$500 to \$2,000; deposition costs from \$300 to \$400; physicians from \$200 or \$300 a day and visual aids about \$100. If the case is expected to go to trial, a lawyer must figure on recovering at least \$10,000 to make the case worthwhile. This certainly is not consumer justice.

The mandate of the Commission authorizes it to explore the safety aspects of products which are used in the home. To fulfill this mandate, the Commission has to date conducted four sets of hearings, each designed to look into a special phase of products and safety standards. Important future hearings are planned. In addition, the Commission has conducted staff evaluations of standards codes and laws relating to product safety. It has planned special surveys in cooperation with insurance associations and received the approval of four medical groups to send questionnaires on product-related injuries to 85,000 physicians.

I believe that the Commission is certainly demonstrating its worth. It has been successful in creating a new awareness of the need for safety standards not only among consumers but also within industry. Throughout its hearings, attention has been focused on laxity as well as efficiency; on responsibility as well as irresponsibility. Its successes point up the welcome fact that many industries are often ready and eager to cooperate when the facts are revealed to them in public hearings. Perhaps through the work of the Commission in the future, industry will no longer need public hearings and disclosure of product defects before doing anything to correct these defects.

Some of the most notable results which public hearings held by the Commission have achieved to date are as follows: In January of this year, hearings were held by the Commission on the dangers of ordinary glass patio doors. Subsequently, the Federal Housing Administration announced its intention to make safety glass a requirement of its minimum property standards. In December, after hearings were held on hazardous toys, a manufacturer of a toy tunnel which was found to be highly flammable issued a call for the return of those still on the shelves of retail merchants. These tunnels will now be flameproofed.

Also, the American Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers voluntarily adopted a standard to require that doors of new freezers be designed to open from the inside as refrigerator doors have been required to do since 1958. The American Gas Association, as a result of evidence given at hearings conducted by the Commission in February of this year, has agreed to consider changes in standards for floor furnaces which are capable of inflicting serious burns, especially on children. Also, Underwriters Laboratories have upgraded a number of their standards and are exercising greater control over the use of the UL seal.

Mr. Speaker, as you and the Members of the House can readily see, the Commission is engaged in important work. It is work which perhaps many of us as consumers do not appreciate because all we see are the unsafe products which are still produced because the Commission has neither the staff nor the funds to investigate them all as yet. I believe that the American consumer is getting a service of inestimable value from the work of the Commission. This work must be continued. To achieve this, we must act favorably on the legislation now being considered by the subcommittee, H.R. 10012 and H.R. 10987.

The consumer needs and deserves all the protection he can get. It is certainly not inconceivable that the Commission could save one life or perhaps prevent one debilitating injury for each dollar we spend to keep it operating. In these days when the value of the dollar appears to be shrinking considerably, the National Commission on Product Safety is the exception. It performs a valuable service to the Nation and serves as a powerful weapon in our arsenal of consumer protection. It should be continued.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10987, a bill to extend for 1 year the National Commission on Product Safety in order that the Commission may complete its assigned tasks.

I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in sponsoring H.R. 10334 which would have accomplished the same purpose as the bill we are considering today and I am happy that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has acted favorably on this legislation. The other body passed this legislation on May 8 of this year.

I applaud the work that Chairman Arnold B. Elkind, the Commissioners, and the staff have accomplished and I know that the Commission will continue to examine thousands of household products to determine if such products present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public, to determine the extent and adequacy of industry self-regulation as well as local, State, and Federal laws to protect consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased with the work the Commission did in looking into the defective design of children's cribs in light of the fact that some 200 infants a year strangle in their cribs. In the Miami, Fla., area alone in a period of 12 years, 11 infants died of strangulation in their cribs. Most of the deaths were attributable to a faulty design of the top of one type of crib, and in other instances two slats along the side which are too widely spaced thus permitting the body of the infant to slide through, but not the head.

I am also pleased that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported H.R. 7621, to amend the Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards and I believe the House will con-

sider this measure within the next week or so.

The work of the Commission has been impressive and I look forward to receiving additional interim reports as well as the final report which will be forthcoming next June.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10987.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 15900) to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks, a bill identical to H.R. 10987, just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(c) of the National Commission on Product Safety Act (Public Law 90-146; 81 Stat. 466) is amended by striking out "two years from the date of approval of this Joint Resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1970".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10987) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11363) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) "fish or wildlife" means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or any part or products or egg thereof;

(3) "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

(4) "person" means any individual, firm, corporation, association, or partnership.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3 of this Act, whoever imports, in violation of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, from any foreign country into the United States any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife which the Secretary has determined, in accordance with the provisions of such sections, to be threatened with worldwide extinction, shall be punished in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) A species or subspecies of fish or wildlife shall be deemed to be threatened with worldwide extinction whenever the Secretary determines, based on the best scientific and commercial data available to him and after consultation, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, with the foreign country or countries in which such fish or wildlife are normally found and, to the extent practicable, with interested persons and organizations and other interested Federal agencies, that the continued existence of such species or subspecies of fish or wildlife is, in the judgment of the Secretary, endangered due to any of the following factors: (1) the destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or the threatened destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, of its habitat, or (2) its overutilization for commercial purposes, or (3) the effect on it of disease or predation, or (4) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence. After making such determination, the Secretary shall promulgate and from time to time he may revise, by regulation, a list in the Federal Register of such fish or wildlife by scientific, common, and commercial name or names, together with his determination. The Secretary shall at least once every five years conduct a thorough review of any such list to determine what, if any, changes have occurred relative to the continued existence of the species or subspecies of fish or wildlife then on the list and to determine whether such fish or wildlife continue to be threatened with worldwide extinction. Upon completion of such review, he shall take appropriate action consistent with the purposes of this Act. The Secretary shall, upon the request of any interested person, also conduct such review of any particular listed species or subspecies at any other time if he finds and publishes his finding that such person has presented substantial evidence to warrant such a review.

(b) In order to minimize undue economic hardship to any person importing any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife which are determined to be threatened with worldwide extinction under this section, under any contract entered into prior to the date of publication of such determination in the Federal Register of such species or subspecies, the Secretary, upon such person filing the application with him and upon filing such information as the Secretary may require showing, to his satisfaction, such hardship, shall permit such person to import such species or subspecies in such quantities and for such periods, not to exceed one year, as he determines to be appropriate.

(c) The Secretary may permit, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the importation of any species or subspecies of fish or wildlife listed in the Federal Register under this section for zoological, educational, and scientific purposes, and for the propagation of such fish or wildlife in captivity for preservation purposes, unless such importation is prohibited by any other Federal law or regulation.

(d) The provisions of section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code shall apply to any regulation issued under this section.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person who violates the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder shall be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$5,000 for each such violation. No penalty shall be assessed unless such person shall be given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge. Each violation shall be a separate offense. Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. Upon any failure to pay the penalty assessed under this section, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to institute a civil action in a district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business to collect the penalty and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide any such action.

(b) Any person who willfully violates the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(c) For the purposes of facilitating enforcement of sections 2 and 3 of this Act and reducing the costs thereof, the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall, after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing, from time to time designate, by regulation, any port or ports in the United States for the importation of fish and wildlife, other than shellfish and fishery products imported for commercial purposes, into the United States. The importation of such fish or wildlife into any port in the United States, except those so designated, shall be prohibited after the effective date of such designations. Such regulations may provide exceptions to such prohibition if the Secretary deems it appropriate and consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

(d) The provisions of sections 2 through 5 of this Act and the regulations issued shall thereunder shall be enforced by either the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury, or both such Secretaries. Either Secretary may utilize by agreement the personnel, services, and facilities of any other Federal agency or any State agency. Any employee of the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Treasury authorized by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury may, without a warrant, arrest any person who, within the employee's presence or view, violates the provisions of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder, and may execute a warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction. An employee who has made an arrest under this Act may search the person arrested at the time of the arrest and seize any fish or wildlife or property of items taken, used, or possessed in violation of this Act or any regulation or permit issued thereunder. Any fish or wildlife or property or items seized shall be held by the employee or by a United States marshal pending disposition of the case by the court, commissioner, or magistrate, except that the Secretary may, in lieu thereof, permit such person to post a bond or other surety satisfactory to him. Upon conviction, any fish or wildlife seized shall be forfeited to the Secretary for disposal by him. Any other property or items seized may, in the discretion of the court, commissioner, or magistrate, be forfeited to the United States or otherwise disposed of.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of sections 2 through 5 of this Act, the Secretary may issue such regulations as may be appropriate.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of

sections 2 through 4 of this Act, the Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall encourage foreign countries to provide protection to species and subspecies of fish and wildlife threatened with worldwide extinction, to take measures to prevent such fish or wildlife from becoming threatened with extinction, and shall cooperate with such countries in providing technical assistance in developing and carrying out programs to provide such protection, and shall, through the Secretary of State, encourage bilateral and multilateral agreements with such countries for the protection, conservation, and propagation of fish or wildlife. The Secretary shall also encourage persons, taking directly or indirectly fish or wildlife in foreign countries for importation into the United States for commercial or other purposes, to develop and carry out, with such assistance as he may provide under any authority available to him, conservation practices designed to enhance such fish or wildlife and their habitats. The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall take appropriate measures to encourage the development of adequate measures, including, if appropriate, international agreements, to prevent such fish or wildlife from becoming threatened with worldwide extinction.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall provide for appropriate coordination of the administration of this Act and amendments made by this Act, with the administration of the animal quarantine laws (21 U.S.C. 101 et seq., 21 U.S.C. 111, 21 U.S.C. 134 et seq.) and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1306).

(b) Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed as superseding or limiting in any manner the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under any other law relating to prohibited or restricted importations of animals and other articles and no proceeding or determination under this Act shall preclude any proceeding or be considered determinative of any issue of fact or law in any proceeding under any Act administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 7. Section 43 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 43. Transportation of Wildlife taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws; receipt; making false records

"(a) Any person who—

"(1) delivers, carries, or transports or causes to be delivered, carried, transported, or shipped for commercial or noncommercial purposes or sells or causes to be sold any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(2) delivers, carries, or transports or causes to be delivered, carried, transported, or shipped for commercial or noncommercial purposes or sells or causes to be sold in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any law or regulation of any State or foreign country; and

"(b) Any person who—

"(1) sells or causes to be sold any products manufactured, made, or processed from any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(2) sells or causes to be sold in interstate or foreign commerce any products manufactured, made, or processed from any wildlife taken in any manner in violation of any law or regulation of a State or a foreign country, or

"(3) having purchased or received wildlife imported from any foreign country or shipped, transported, or carried in interstate commerce, makes or causes to be made any false record, account, label, or identification thereof, or

"(4) receives, acquires, or purchases for commercial or noncommercial purposes any wildlife—

"(A) taken in violation of any law or regulation of any State or foreign country and delivered, carried, transported, or shipped by any means or method in interstate or foreign commerce, or

"(B) taken in violation of any Act of Congress or regulation issued thereunder, or

"(5) imports from Mexico to any State, or exports from any State to Mexico, any game mammal, dead or alive, or part or product thereof, except under permit or other authorization of the Secretary or, in accordance with any regulations prescribed by him, having due regard to the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty with Mexico and the laws of the United States forbidding importation of certain live mammals injurious to agriculture and horticulture;

shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in subsections (c) and (d) of this section.

"(c) Any person who knowingly or has reason to know violates the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of not more than \$5,000 for each such violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. No penalty shall be assessed unless such person shall be given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge. Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Secretary. Upon any failure to pay the penalty assessed under this section, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to institute a civil action in a district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business to collect the penalty and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide any such action.

"(d) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(e) Any wildlife or products thereof seized in connection with any violation of this section shall be forfeited to the Secretary to be disposed of by him in such manner as he deems appropriate.

"(f) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(2) 'person' means any individual, firm, corporation, association, or partnership;

"(3) 'wildlife' means any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or any part or egg thereof, but does not include migratory birds for which protection is afforded under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended;

"(4) 'State' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

"(5) 'taken' means captured, killed, collected, or otherwise possessed."

SEC. 8. Section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42," after "to enforce section" and by inserting a comma after "43".

SEC. 9. Section 3112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "42," after "to enforce sections" and by inserting a comma after "43".

SEC. 10. The first paragraph in section 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting "wild animals or birds, or the dead bodies or parts thereof," and inserting "any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, or reptile, or any mollusk or crustacean, or the dead body or parts or eggs thereof."

(b) Section 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"In any case where the marking, labeling, or tagging of a package under this section

indicating in any way the contents thereof would lead to the possibility of theft of the package or its contents, and affect the ability to insure the package and its contents, the Secretary of the Interior may, upon request of the owner thereof or his agent or by regulation, provide some other reasonable means of notifying appropriate authorities of the contents of such packages."

SEC. 11. (a) Section 2 of the Black Bass Act (44 Stat. 576), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to deliver or receive for transportation, or to transport, by any means whatsoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, any black bass or other fish, if (1) such delivery or transportation is contrary to the law of the State, territory, or the District of Columbia or any foreign country from which such black bass or other fish is found or transported, or is contrary to other applicable law, or (2) such black bass or other fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or foreign country, in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported, or contrary to other applicable law; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such black bass or other fish which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this Act; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of black bass or other fish transported in interstate or foreign commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment. For the purpose of this section, the provisions of section 10 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the term 'interstate or foreign commerce.'"

(b) Section 3 of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852a), is amended by deleting the comma after "commerce" and inserting therein "or foreign commerce."

(c) Section 6(a) of the Black Bass Act (46 Stat. 846), as amended (16 U.S.C. 852d (a)), is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "The provisions of this section and any regulations issued thereunder shall be enforced by personnel of the Secretary of the Interior, and he may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, personnel, services, and facilities of other Federal agencies."

SEC. 12. The second paragraph of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 705), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. The provisions of sections 1 through 12 of this Act shall be effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. (a) Section 1 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa), is amended by adding new subsection at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of sections 1 through 3 of this Act, the term 'fish and wildlife' means any wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean."

(b) The last sentence of section 2(c) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668bb(c)), is amended by changing the "\$750,000" to "\$2,500,000".

(c) Section 2(d) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668bb(d)), is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise any privately owned land, water, or interests therein within the boundaries of any area administered by him, for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, or propagating any selected species of native fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction and each such acquisition shall be admin-

istered in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such area, and there is authorized to be appropriated annually for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 not to exceed \$1,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this sentence."

(d) The provisions of sections 1 through 5 of this Act and sections 1 through 3 of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa-668cc), as amended by this section, shall hereinafter be cited as the "Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969."

(e) The second sentence of section 1(a) of the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668aa(a)), is amended by changing the comma after the word "extinction" to a period and deleting the remainder of the sentence.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11363 is threefold. First, in order to assist on an international level in the preservation of threatened species of fish and wildlife, the legislation would prohibit the importation into the United States of any species that has been determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be threatened with extinction on a worldwide basis.

Second, in order to assist the States in stopping or reducing illegal traffic in certain protected species of fish and wildlife, such as the alligator, the legislation would make it unlawful for anyone knowingly put into interstate commerce or foreign commerce, any such species taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law.

Third, in order to assist in protecting endangered species of native fish or wildlife, the legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire privately owned lands within the boundaries of any area administered by him for the purpose of conserving and protecting such species.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, essentially this same legislation in the form of H.R. 11618 was considered and passed by the House under suspension of the rules in February of last year, but failed to pass in the Senate. At that time, I pointed out the need for this legislation and called to the attention of the House Members that in 1966, the House considered what is known as the Endangered Species Act. The purpose of that act is to carry out a program with respect to native fish and wildlife that are found to be threatened with extinction.

During the passage of that act, it was brought out that in the United States and Puerto Rico alone, 24 birds and 12 mammals had become extinct, and many other species were on the verge of becoming extinct. A recent list of the world's rare and endangered species of wildlife compiled by an international conservation organization includes about 250 mammals and 300 birds. When a list

has been compiled by the Secretary of the Interior on all species of fish and wildlife—including amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans—I am sure it will contain as many as 1,000 species. Unless some appropriate action is taken such as that envisioned by this legislation, that list will continue to grow and Mr. Speaker, we owe it to ourselves and to future generations to participate in a worldwide effort to preserve this priceless heritage.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated previously, the second purpose of this legislation is to assist in eliminating illegal traffic in certain species taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law. Many species of mammals are becoming endangered because of their demand for wearing apparel or novelty uses. Poaching to supply these markets is a lucrative enterprise in Asia and Africa as well as here in the United States. Thus far, efforts on the part of these countries have not been successful in stopping this traffic. As indicated at the hearings on the legislation, there are about 1,000 poachers active in taking alligators in the southern part of Florida alone, and it is not uncommon for a poacher to make as much as \$500 a week furnishing alligators to wearing apparel and luggage manufacturers. This legislation is designed to solve this problem by eliminating the market.

Briefly explained, section 1 of the bill would define certain terms used throughout the legislation.

Section 2 would provide for the punishment of those who import species in violation of the provisions of the import restrictions.

Section 3 would provide the criteria for the Secretary of the Interior to use when determining whether a species is threatened with worldwide extinction. In making this determination, the Secretary would be required to consult and work closely with the affected foreign country and other interested persons and organizations. When a species has been determined to be endangered, the Secretary would list its name in the Federal Register. At least once every 5 years the list would be reviewed by the Secretary with a view toward removing species which may not be endangered at that time. Also, this section would allow threatened species to be imported for zoological, educational, scientific, and propagation purposes, and in addition, would allow in hardship cases up to 1 year for importers of such species to dispose of their current supply before being in violation of the import prohibition.

Section 4 would authorize the Secretary to assess violators a civil penalty of prohibition a criminal penalty of not more than \$5,000, and in case of violators willfully violating the import more than \$10,000, or 1 year imprisonment, or both. The enforcement of the import prohibition would be carried out by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Treasury, or both. As a means toward facilitating enforcement and reducing the cost of the legislation, the importation of all fish and wildlife would be prohibited, except at ports designated

as ports of entry by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 5 would require the Secretary of the Interior, through the Secretary of State, to encourage foreign countries to take the necessary steps to prevent species from becoming endangered and through bilateral and multilateral agreements encourage such countries to take such measures as may be necessary to protect and even enhance fish or wildlife that may be threatened with worldwide extinction.

Section 6 would require the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate the administration of the act with the Secretary of Agriculture in his administration of the animal quarantine laws and the Tariff Act of 1930.

Present law makes it unlawful for anyone knowingly to put into interstate or foreign commerce any wild mammal or bird, or the dead body or part thereof, which has been taken, captured, killed, purchased, sold or transported contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law.

Section 7 would rewrite this law to extend this protection to amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans, including any products manufactured or processed therefrom.

Section 7 would also provide that anyone who knowingly, or has reason to know, violates the provisions of this section shall be subject to a civil fine of not more than \$5,000, and when the violation has been knowingly and willfully committed, a criminal penalty of not more than \$10,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

Section 42 of the Criminal Code governs the importation of injurious species of fish and wildlife. It contains no provision for arrest of persons committing violations of the law, execution of warrants, nor for search and seizure. This authority, however, does exist in connection with the enforcement of sections 43 and 44 of this same title.

Sections 8 and 9 of the bill would extend these greatly needed enforcement provisions to section 42 of the criminal code.

Present law makes it unlawful for anyone to put into interstate or foreign commerce any package containing wild animals or birds, or the dead body or parts thereof, without plainly marking, labeling or tagging such package.

Section 10 would extend this protection to amphibians, reptiles, mollusks, and crustaceans. Other reasonable means of identifying the contents of a package would be authorized in those cases where it is likely to cause theft or where it is likely insurance would be denied.

The Black Bass Act now makes it unlawful for anyone to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation or knowingly transport in interstate or foreign commerce or to or through a foreign country any black bass or other fish taken contrary to a Federal, State, or foreign law. That act does not now apply to imported fish.

Section 11 would assist in reducing this illegal traffic by making the prohibition of the Black Bass Act applicable to imported fish.

Section 12 would repeal a portion of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act relating to shipment of wild game mammals or parts thereof to and from Mexico since this provision has been included in section 7 of the bill to become a part of section 43 of title 18, United States Code.

Section 13 would provide that provisions 1 through 12 of this act shall be effective 180 days after date of enactment.

Section 14 would extend the protection of the 1966 Endangered Species Act to include in addition to native fish and wildlife, any wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean.

In addition, it would increase the amount of funds authorized to acquire lands in any one area under the 1966 act from \$750,000 to \$2,500,000, and also, it would enlarge the acquisition authority to authorize the Secretary to expend up to \$1,000,000 per year for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, to acquire any privately owned lands and waters within the boundaries of any lands administered by him.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony at the hearings was overwhelmingly in support of the legislation. All Department reports were favorable and all amendments suggested by the Departments and all major amendments suggested by the witnesses testifying at the hearings were adopted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and included in the clean bill now under consideration, H.R. 11363.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I wholeheartedly endorse this measure and urge its prompt passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was unable to hear the gentleman.

Well, first of all, on page 15 are these paragraphs or subparagraphs properly labeled? I note they are listed as (a), (d), (b), and (c)? I am referring to page 15 of the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I assume the gentleman is referring to lines 10, 13, and 16; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is referring to lines 10, 13, and 16?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to lines 7 through 15.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering if these paragraphs or subparagraphs are correctly and properly listed. They are arranged in the bill in this order: (a), (d), (b), and (c).

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; the paragraphs are listed correctly.

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) relate to section 14 of the bill and the "d" provision found on line 10 is the new language to be added to subsection (d) of the 1966 Endangered Species Act. It is just a matter of draftsmanship.

Mr. GROSS. On line 13, the changing

of the figure of \$750,000 to \$2.5 million; would the gentleman again state what this means?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. The original act, the act of October 15, 1966, is the Endangered Species Act. That act provided for a limitation of \$750,000 that could be expended in any one area for the acquisition of endangered species habitat. There are some desirable lands now available for acquisition, particularly near Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and Mason Neck, Va., if this limitation is raised.

The \$750,000 limitation has been found to be inadequate. The committee, upon the recommendation of the Department of the Interior, on several different occasions, early in February and then in March, and finally in May, has increased that figure to \$2.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the first change made in the expansion of this program?

Mr. DINGELL. This is the first change that has been made in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this, but there is a total price tag of \$1 million for each of the years 1970, 1971, and 1972; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. For the 3 years 1970, 1971, and 1972 there is a \$1 million authorization, and the administrative cost is \$145,000. These funds would be used to acquire in-holdings by the Secretary. For example, alligator in-holdings are now available for acquisition and they should be acquired before they are directed to other use.

Mr. GROSS. At \$1 million for each of the 3 years?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill provide any kind of commission or advisory board, or anything of that kind?

Mr. DINGELL. No; we do not set up any commission or advisory board, or anything of that kind, with this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. The \$3 million would then go to the Department of the Interior for administration of this act?

Mr. DINGELL. No; the administration costs in connection with the control of imports is estimated to be \$145,000 a year. The committee very carefully held the administrative costs low by prescribing the ports through which imports may be brought, and by utilizing as fully as possible the existing facilities of the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Agriculture, so as to utilize existing authorities and existing personnel as much as possible in the control of imports. We have actually limited the ports through which endangered species and through which different animals generally may be imported. By limiting ports of entry, we can control the expenses and the amount of animals that can come in.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the money being expended?

Mr. DINGELL. The \$1 million to which the gentleman refers is for acquisition of real property within the boundaries of the areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior, where it is necessary to make this kind of expenditure for purposes of protection of endangered species

of wildlife—and I mentioned the alligators to my good friend from Iowa earlier as an example.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) who has been so instrumental in the enactment of this bill, and who was its original author, and who is so interested in its passage.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to compliment the gentleman again for providing the leadership needed to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, in urging prompt passage of my bill, H.R. 11363.

As the Members of the House will remember, essentially the same legislation was considered and passed on the floor of the House last year but failed to receive favorable action in the Senate. Because of my continued interest in preserving and protecting endangered species, I introduced legislation early in this session of the Congress, H.R. 248. Subsequently, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries introduced the administration bill on this legislation, H.R. 4812. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 11363, is a clean bill I introduced along with 18 other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This bill incorporates the provisions of H.R. 248, H.R. 4812, all amendments suggested by the Departments and all major amendments suggested by witnesses testifying at the hearings on the legislation.

The legislation has the unanimous endorsement of the committee, all national conservation organizations and all Government agencies reporting on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly comment on several sections of the bill which I am particularly pleased to support. First, as all of us know, because of our great economic growth and affluence, we have been responsible for the disappearance of many species of fish and wildlife here in the United States. Altogether, some 24 birds and 12 mammals which were once native to the United States have become extinct. Fortunately in 1966, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries acted and reported legislation which ultimately was enacted into public law to assist in protecting our native species of fish and wildlife. The last section of this bill would broaden the authority contained in the act to allow the Secretary of the Interior to acquire privately owned lands within Federal areas administered by him. It was brought to the attention of the committee that there are several tracts of desirable lands available for acquisition at this time and it was for this reason that the committee unanimously agreed to include in the bill an authorization appropriation of up to \$1 million per year

for a period of 3 years in which to acquire these lands. It is most imperative that these lands which are so valuable for the preservation of endangered species be acquired before they are diverted to other uses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation should be of valuable assistance in eliminating the illegal traffic in alligator hides here in the United States. As was indicated by the Interior Department witness at the hearing on this legislation, there are approximately 1,000 poachers active in the State of Florida alone. I might add that in my State of North Carolina poaching is a problem but not as much so as in the State of Florida since there are few alligators left to poach.

After considering the evidence presented at the hearings, the committee concluded that the Lacey Act under which violators would be punished did not contain sufficient penalties. Therefore, the committee in its wisdom, decided to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to impose a civil penalty upon anyone who knowingly puts into interstate commerce any species of wild mammal, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean taken in violation of a Federal, State, or foreign law. In addition, anyone who knowingly and willfully violates the provisions of this section would be subject to a criminal penalty of not more than \$10,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this legislation, I think, will go far toward eliminating the market for species illegally taken and put into interstate commerce and also would provide valuable assistance in carrying out our Nation's goal of preserving species that are threatened with extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt passage of H.R. 11363.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend from North Carolina, and I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his interest in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11363, a bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire inholdings located wholly within the boundaries of federally owned and managed lands.

This legislation is very similar to H.R. 11618 which passed the House in the 90th Congress and which was favorably reported by the Senate Commerce Committee but did not come before that body for a vote. I actively supported that bill, and had introduced similar legislation. Again this year I introduced legislation, and am a cosponsor of the bill before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is threefold:

First, to assist the several States in stopping or reducing illegal traffic in certain protected animals, this legisla-

tion would make it unlawful for anyone to knowingly put into interstate or foreign commerce any amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or parts thereof taken contrary to any Federal, State, or foreign laws or regulations. Present law extends this protection only to wild mammals or wild birds, or fish, or parts thereof.

Second, to eliminate known refuges for poachers, this legislation would permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, donation, exchange or otherwise any inholdings which have proven to be trouble spots in the effort to protect endangered species.

Third, to assist on an international level in the preservation of threatened species, this legislation would prohibit the importation of any species of wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean, or parts thereof that are threatened with extinction. The Secretary of the Interior could make exception for zoological, educational and scientific purposes, and for the purposes of breeding for preservation and propagation.

I am particularly interested in section 7 of the bill as reported because it is aimed at a problem with which I am most familiar; the threatened extinction of the American alligator.

Mr. Speaker, this majestic beast, a living fossil from the age of reptiles which flourished some 200 million years ago, is indigenous to the south central part of the State of Florida, the area which I have the privilege to represent in the Congress.

Today, human greed and vanity threaten the American alligator just as human greed and vanity threatened the American bison and the egret 100 years ago.

A finished alligator suitcase will sell for up to \$1,000; men's alligator shoes retail at \$70 or more. Prime alligator hides bring \$8 per linear foot from dealers who do not question their origin, and it is estimated that the illegal market of skins in Miami, Fla., alone is in excess of \$1 million per year.

This bill would provide a civil penalty of up to \$5,000 against anyone who knowingly or has reason to know that he has delivered, carried, transported, or sold any wildlife or products thereof taken contrary to State, National, or foreign laws. A criminal penalty of up to \$10,000, or not more than 1 year in prison, is imposed upon anyone who knowingly and willfully commits the same violations.

Under present law, if the poacher is not caught in the act of catching or slaughtering an alligator, and if he can get the carcass or skin to a dealer, there is little State or Federal officials can do. This legislation would close that loophole in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation because I believe that man should not be callous and indifferent to the devastating exploitation of his natural resources, nor should man naively believe that other species will continue to exist on the face of the earth without his aid and protection.

I hope the House will pass this legis-

lation today, and that the other body will act swiftly in order that the bill may become law.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I now yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), who is a member of the committee, and who has contributed much to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of H.R. 11363.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering legislation which recognizes and purports to remedy the threatened extinction of several species of fish and wildlife. H.R. 11363, of which I am a cosponsor, is the result of extensive hearings held during the 90th and 91st Congresses by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As a member of this distinguished committee, which is so vitally concerned with the protection and preservation of endangered species, I urge my fellow Members to join in supporting this excellent bill.

H.R. 11363 recognizes the inadequacies of our present law in dealing with certain endangered species and as such, it contains three principal provisions. It prohibits, except for zoological, educational, scientific, and propagation purposes—the importation into the United States of any species or subspecies of wild mammal, fish, wild bird, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, or crustacean or any part or products thereof that are threatened with worldwide extinction. The bill also prohibits anyone knowingly to put into interstate or foreign commerce any such species taken contrary to Federal, State, or foreign laws or regulations. Present law protects only wild mammals or wild birds or parts thereof. The obvious objective of this bill is to expand such coverage to include certain species of fish and wildlife, increasing in demand because of their potential value as novelties or wearing apparel. As examples, one can look immediately to the alligator and the zebra, whose numbers have been dangerously reduced to satisfy a continually growing market.

To implement these provisions, H.R. 11363 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the authority to determine that a species is threatened with extinction on a worldwide basis before listing it in the Federal Register as an endangered species. To make such a determination, the Secretary shall consult with the foreign countries affected, scientific and conservation organizations, fish and wildlife specialists, Federal agencies, and other interested parties. The Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is also empowered to name the ports of entry into the United States for such commodities. Failure to comply with the bill's import or transportation prohibition provisions can bring a civil penalty of \$5,000 for each violation and a criminal penalty of \$10,000 or 1 year imprisonment or both, for each violation. The severity of the penalties is specifically aimed at reducing and eventually eliminating the illegal traffic in threatened species.

In order to assist in the preservation of species on an international level, one

section of H.R. 11363 calls on the United States to assume a central role in encouraging foreign countries to adopt similar protective measures. It is the intent of the committee that the Secretaries of Interior and State utilize every effort to achieve the "enactment and enforcement" of endangered species legislation as soon as possible. During the hearings it was revealed that the widely respected International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources had prepared an international convention with discussions currently underway for hopeful approval by a large number of nations in 1970.

It is evident from testimony before the committee that this legislation is urgently needed to preserve and protect those selected species in danger of extinction. H.R. 11363 is an amended version of a bill which passed the House last year. Among those amendments included in this new bill, I am pleased that my bill, H.R. 8853, is contained in section 14 of the legislation. Section 14 would in effect, authorize the expenditure of \$1,750,000 by the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands adjacent to areas administered by him for endangered species purposes. This will accomplish the purposes of my bill, which is to authorize the necessary funding to acquire a desirable habitat adjacent to Mason Neck in Virginia. I have been advised by the Interior Department that the available lands would cost approximately \$1.5 million and I urge the speedy enactment of this bill into public law as these lands should be acquired while available and at reasonable prices.

I will describe briefly the purposes of my bill, H.R. 8853. H.R. 8853 authorizes a particular expenditure for the acquisition of Mason Neck, a valuable tract of land along the Potomac River about 18 miles from Washington. The land is considered essential to the preservation and propagation of the bald eagle, our national emblem, since it serves as a valuable roosting and nesting area for a magnificent bird on the verge of extinction along the eastern seaboard. Valuable for recreational as well as conservation purposes, the area embraces about 4,000 acres of upland forest and woodland swamps and contains up to 20 roosting areas and two known nesting areas. As many as four pairs of eagles have nested on Mason Neck in recent years and the area is the natural habitat of many other animals, birds, trees, and flowers. Mason Neck would provide worthwhile recreational and educational opportunities for such activities as wildlife photography, nature walks, bird watching, and other natural history pursuits.

Other wildlife using the area include wild turkeys, pileated woodpeckers, and white-tailed deer. My colleagues will be interested to know, too, that according to the Interior Department, one reason for the decline of the bald eagle is the increase in human population in primary nesting areas. This has resulted in the disturbance of nesting birds, illegal shooting, loss of nest trees, and possible reduced reproduction as a result of pesticides ingested with foods by adult birds.

We will be enabled now to protect these awesome creatures through acquisition of these needed lands in Mason Neck, Va.

The provisions of H.R. 11363, which have been subject to careful attention and scrutiny by the committee are vital to the preservation and protection of several species threatened with extinction. Many species of mammals and birds will be guaranteed continuation if this bill is enacted into law. Several species of the cat, rhinoceros, deer, pheasant, and fish families, to name a few, will be afforded necessary protection, in addition, of course, to the alligators and zebras. H.R. 11363 is most deserving of our enthusiastic support and I urge passage of the bill by the House.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would like to ask the gentleman one question with regard to section 7.

The gentleman has also referred to section 12, wherein the gentleman mentions the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and that is included also in section 7. So I would like to ask the gentleman whether this would prohibit the importation from Mexico of any wild animals, birds, and so forth, that have been killed contrary to a foreign law, and whether this would determine the laws of the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. My question is—

Mr. DINGELL. That is, by the way, a portion of the Lacey Act, not the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It is quoted here as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act but, nonetheless, my question is, does this also give us the positive assumption that you can bring in anything you can legally kill in a foreign country?

Mr. DINGELL. There has never been any problem with regard to the importation of game taken in Mexico. The only requirement is that the person have a permit, and the Secretary has been issuing these on species that are not endangered, as a fairly routine matter.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Then the statement of the gentleman is that if you can kill 12 birds per day in Mexico, legally you could import them if you had the necessary permits, and so forth?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas, that you can providing that they are not an endangered species, and that it is not above and beyond the game limit, either on a per day or season basis in Mexico, and you obtain a permit from the Secretary of the Interior. This section applies to both legally and illegally taken species.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. They can be imported under those circumstances?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman on his interests in the preservation of endangered species. In my area we have the

white winged dove that is so famous, and that is in a state of almost extinction.

I think possibly, working with the gentleman later, that this act would be very beneficial in having the Secretary of the Interior interest himself in this matter to see if possibly some coverage or acreage could be secured in order that it might help to preserve this species.

Mr. DINGELL. I would be most happy to work with my good friend.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Thomas J. Lloyd, president, and Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, of the Amalgamated Meat & Butcher Workmen of North America. This union has been most cooperative in resolving the different views concerning the legislation, as introduced, and I want the RECORD to show that this fine organization now supports the legislation and the committee is most appreciative of their concerted efforts in behalf of conservation.

The letter follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,

Chicago, Ill., July 18, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) supports the endangered species legislation which the House of Representatives will consider on Monday. We believe the bill will bring about the necessary protection for various types of animals which are in danger of becoming extinct. We also believe that the bill provides the necessary protection for workers in the fur and leather industries against the loss of jobs due to any arbitrary banning of imports of skins.

We appreciate the leadership you have given on this legislation. You and your Subcommittee have drafted a bill which will achieve the goals of conservation without endangering employment in the fur and leather industries. We are delighted that our Union was able to play a part in helping to reconcile the differences which previously existed on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD,
President.
PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I think the bill we are considering today is an extremely important one—not just to Americans—but to everyone in the world who appreciates nature and wants to preserve one of earth's most priceless resources—its animal kingdom.

Instead of stressing technicalities, it might help to state that, basically, this bill (H.R. 11363) is designed to prevent and discourage the repulsive and destructive practice of poaching. Poaching is a monstrous and criminal act against nature, and it should be stopped. Many animals around the world are endangered; they face complete extinction because greedy men hunt them and kill them for their furs, or their skins—or even because they are rare.

In the United States, the alligator is killed wantonly for its leather, without

regard to State laws or the drastically reduced number of the species available. Other animals, in other lands, are in danger of being completely exterminated from the face of the earth, because selling their hides or heads or other portions is a lucrative business for unscrupulous hunters and trappers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to emphasize that many other nations share our concern; these nations also have laws prohibiting the taking of any species they consider endangered. But such laws do not stop the poaching, the illegal traffic in animals that provide a lucrative living to those who are willing to risk dealing in this illegal traffic.

What this bill does is seek to eliminate the market; if this is done, then it will no longer be profitable for the poacher to poach.

Mr. Speaker, there are other things this bill seeks to do and there are other reasons for supporting it, but I know that these have all been sufficiently explained today by many of my distinguished colleagues who have spoken in favor of this legislation.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation, and I hope subsequent enactment of the law will also be swift.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the able gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, and the able gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the subcommittee, and other members of the committee for bringing this legislation to the House.

As the report shows, I was one of those who introduced a kindred bill in the House.

This bill will be particularly meaningful to my State because unlawful poachers are threatening the alligator population in the Everglades National Park and in other parks in the State of Florida.

By prohibiting this and making it an offense against the Federal law to export out of Florida alligators in violation of State law, I hope this measure will do much to curb this unlawful and very dangerous practice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. H.R. 11363 will, I believe, prove to be one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation enacted by the Congress.

In 1966, the first endangered species bill was enacted. That legislation, Public Law 89-669, was concerned with the preservation of our native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds that are threatened with extinction. The endangered species law has been a valuable tool enabling the Secretary of the Interior to identify and take steps to preserve a large number of mammals, birds and fish which would otherwise soon disappear from the United States. The scope of the endangered species law

is, however, unwisely restricted, and its enforcement and penalty provisions are inadequate.

A great many species of mammals, birds, reptiles and lesser creatures are now threatened with extinction on a worldwide scale. These include species of elephants, tigers, and many varieties of colorful birds and fish. The threat to these animals is two-fold. The ever-increasing population of the world constantly requires additional land for cultivation and settlement. In Africa and Asia particularly, the native habitat of many animals is being destroyed at an ever-increasing rate. There is perhaps little that we can do to insure the survival of these rare animals in the face of man's ever-increasing need for land.

That, however, is only one aspect of the problem. The other danger facing so many animals, birds, and other land creatures is man's vanity and desire for profit. The commercial exploitation of rare species has reached alarming proportions. The skins, the feathers, the tusks and other distinctive parts of these animals are demanded throughout the world. Although many countries are aware of the impending loss of these irreplaceable resources, they do not have the means to effectively prevent unlawful commercial hunting.

The United States, being the most affluent country in the world, is also the greatest market for these exotic species of wildlife. Unless the commercial market in the United States can be controlled, efforts of other countries to protect their native species will be largely in vain.

The first major provision of H.R. 11363, therefore, is to prohibit the importation into the United States of any species of wild mammal, bird, fish or lower form of animal life that is threatened with worldwide extinction.

This provision of the bill has been very carefully drawn to protect the legitimate interests of the scientific community, zoological institutions, and others who are interested in importing endangered species for the purpose of scientific research and efforts to propagate them in the United States. It also has been written in consultation with the responsible fur and animal importing industry to protect legitimate existing contractual rights and obligations.

The activities of the Secretary of the Interior in promulgating the list of threatened species will be coordinated with the commercial as well as the scientific community. This legislation is the result of close cooperation between all groups interested in the reasonable and legitimate use and preservation of these irreplaceable resources.

As I first indicated, the endangered species law of 1966 was directed to our United States only. Unfortunately, man's desire to exterminate the greatest number of valuable animals for commercial gain is not limited to other parts of the world. We have excellent examples of this tendency within our own borders. Perhaps the best publicized and, at the same time, the most important example of this senseless extermination involves the Florida alligator. If significant steps are not taken now to protect

the alligator, it will disappear. The only way that these creatures and others in the United States can be protected from illegal commercial exploitation is to bring the full force of our Federal law enforcement efforts to bear. Only if the interstate market for these animals can be cut off will the alligator and other commercially desirable endangered species be saved. It accomplishes little for one State to prohibit the taking of an animal if a poacher can ship that animal with impunity from one State to another, or at the worst suffer the payment of a nominal fine if caught.

H.R. 11363 will therefore assist the States in stopping the illegal traffic in protected species of wildlife by making it unlawful for anyone to knowingly place such species in interstate or foreign commerce contrary to Federal, State, or foreign law. The bill provides civil penalties of up to \$5,000 against anyone who knowingly violates the law and criminal penalties of up to \$10,000 or 1 year imprisonment or both for willful violation. The criminal sanctions are intended to reach the large-scale commercial poachers or dealers in illegally-taken wildlife.

The original endangered species bill authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for the purpose of conserving the habitat of species threatened with extinction. The Secretary also is authorized to utilize funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for this purpose. He was limited, however, to the use of not more than \$750,000 to acquire lands in any one area. This figure has proven to be much too low and has greatly restricted the full implementation of the endangered species law. Under present law, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire private tracts located within the boundaries of designated wildlife refuges. Various existing statutes however, limit the dollar amount which may be expended to acquire such inholdings.

H.R. 11363 will increase the maximum amount which the Secretary may expend to acquire any one area to \$2½ million and will authorize him to expend up to \$1 million annually for the acquisition of privately owned tracts within Federal preserves without regard to monetary limitations which may exist in other laws with respect to specific parks or refuges.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation was passed last year, but unfortunately was not acted upon by the other body. It has been revised extensively in conjunction with all interested segments of industry and conservation groups and is supported by them. This legislation is vital for the preservation of rare species of wildlife for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. I urge its unanimous passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very

pleased that the House of Representatives is today considering legislation which I have long advocated and which is so important to the conservation of our Nation's resources—the endangered species bill.

Let me give you a graphic example of the senseless waste which the provisions of this bill would help prevent. Imagine if you will a dark and peaceful night in one of our great national parks. Suddenly the peace is broken by the noise of an airboat skimming across the sawgrass. A spotlight beams over the black water until it rests on the red reflection of an alligator's eyes.

Quickly two men flip the entranced creature onto the boat, and with a deadly blow from a sledge hammer they crush the alligator's skull. Next one of the men finishes the brutal business by implanting a hatchet in the reptile's brain and chopping through the spine in back of the head. Once the muscle spasms have terminated, they begin to skin the innocent creature.

This happened last night in Everglades National Park. It also happened the night before last, and the night before the night before last. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this grim scene is repeated many times every night. Florida's alligators are survivors from the age of reptiles, millions of years ago. But today the lure of profit from the sales of handbags, shoes, souvenirs, and fashion accessories threatens to do what time has not been able to. This was brought home dramatically to Secretary Walter Hickel when he recently assumed the role of a poacher in a night raid in the Everglades and escaped detection.

The endangered species bill would effectively bring a halt to the incentive for this carnage by providing penalties of fines and imprisonment for the interstate shipping of species protected by State law. The importation of endangered species into the United States would also be prohibited.

This measure would provide the Secretary of the Interior with the means to protect the more than 75 species which his Department has recently identified as being in danger of extinction.

The House of Representatives has long been aware of the critical problem of endangered species, and last year, recognizing the pressing need for the provisions of this bill, it was passed by this Chamber. Unfortunately late session amendments prevented its passage in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now, while there is still time to save the species of wildlife which face a cruel extinction without our help. I urge our colleagues to join in support of this important and merciful legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of the bill before us, the endangered species bill. It will help to preserve on an international level some species of wildlife that are endangered. It will also prevent the illegal transportation of endangered species and the products thereof within the United States. Finally, it would allow the Secretary of Interior to acquire privately owned lands within any area administered by him

for the conservation of rare wildlife. Each of these objectives is meritorious.

I particularly know of the need to prevent the transportation within the United States of the products of the Florida alligator. If this is not accomplished the alligator is indeed threatened with extinction. I also know of the need to allow the Secretary to acquire certain private lands within areas where an endangered species is present and which are administered by the Secretary. A typical case in point would seem to be the Key deer of southeastern Florida. Although at the moment they are being protected, it would seem that, without the acquisition of additional lands, there may well be a time in the near future when the land actually available may not be sufficient, because of developments.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 11363, a bill that would put new strength into the worldwide effort to protect species of wildlife threatened with extinction.

The need for this bill is clear and pressing.

Thousands of species of wildlife ranging from mountain gorillas to tropical fish are slowly disappearing because hunters want them as trophies, because zoos want them as displays, because collectors want them as curios, because clothing manufacturers want them as a source of skins and furs.

To supply these markets poachers are flouting conservation laws throughout the world, killing off millions of rare creatures each year.

Shall we allow the alligator to die out merely because women like durable handbags? Shall we countenance the extinction of the leopard merely to provide coats for the grande dames of society? Shall we sit back and watch the gorilla disappear from its native habitat merely to stock the cages of the zoos and circuses? Shall we tolerate the slaughter of the Ceylon elephant merely to provide ivory for trinkets and ornaments?

Thousands of creatures—running the zoological gamut from mammals, to fish, to birds, to amphibians, to reptiles, to mollusks, to crustaceans—face extinction unless the United States and other nations join forces now to protect them.

Over 40 species of wildlife were exterminated between 1910 and 1945 alone. Since 1945 the extinction rate has been accelerating rapidly—so rapidly that scientists, conservationists, and ordinary people the world over are expressing alarm.

H.R. 11363 would help knit together international efforts to protect endangered species. This bill would outlaw the importation into the United States of any creature put on an "endangered list" drawn up by the U.S. Interior Department in cooperation with foreign countries. The bill, moreover, would strengthen and broaden our domestic laws prohibiting interstate traffic in endangered species.

I want to make it clear that H.R. 11363 would not stop the importation or transportation of rare wildlife taken legally for zoological, scientific, or educational purposes.

A few statistics point out the mag-

nitude of the problem that H.R. 11363 would help solve. At one New York City airport last year, during a 2-month period alone, 830,000 creatures were imported into this country. Among them were 20,000 birds, 790,000 fishes, 4,000 primates, 6,000 reptiles, and hundreds of large animals.

Many of the creatures in these shipments clearly fit into the category of "endangered species."

Dr. Theodore H. Reed, Director of the National Zoological Park, said in hearings before the Congress:

The United States is the most lucrative market for birds, monkeys, furs, hides, and other animals and animal products. Too often our dollars are the reward sought by the poachers and smugglers. * * * It is unfortunately true that the temptation of dollars encourages lawbreaking and at times leads to the corruption of officials responsible for wildlife law enforcement.

When such large rewards are available, it is profitable to evade the law, and smuggling becomes a major problem.

The case of the orangutan is relevant. This gravely endangered species survives only in Sumatra and Borneo, where it is under full legal protection. The temptation to disregard these laws was great, however. A smuggler would buy illegally taken orangutans in Sumatra for as little as \$5. They could be sold to zoos for \$3,000 or more.

Until a few years ago, most orangutans bought by zoos had illegal origins. Zoo buyers could close their eyes to this, because they bought from dealers who in turn bought from other dealers. Zoos did not know where the animals came from or how these animals began their journeys.

In this case, zoos took the initiative in suppressing the illegal trade. Recognizing that zoo purchases could add to the danger of extinction, our American zoos, in 1962, resolved that we would no longer purchase orangutans without evidence of legal origins.

Stanley A. Cain, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department, pointed out in hearings that illegal traffic in domestic wildlife is also becoming a significant problem. Mr. Cain testified that a park ranger in the Florida Everglades estimated that 1,000 poachers are hunting alligators in southern Florida. Mr. Cain added:

It is possible for a poacher to make as much as \$100 in one night's foraging for these skins because raw skins are now bringing \$6 a linear foot. Several of these poachers are said to make \$400 and \$500 a week when they are at this illegal business. The total market for these skins in Miami, the illegal market, is in excess of \$1 million. I am quoting these data from this ranger.

The protection service provided by the National Park and by the State game agents is entirely inadequate to significantly check this illegal traffic so that we are getting at the critical point where we are hurting them in the pocketbook.

I think if we had more officials it would help to check this process, but the real problem I believe is the economic problem. If there are means of curbing the market for the sale of such products * * * you get at the profit. Until very recently, well, for centuries, people have lived in the Gulf States and alligators were never threatened. It is only recently when the alligator hides have been used for fashion purposes that the commerce has gone up, and it is the dollar profit that is threatening the species.

The Congress must act to strengthen the laws protecting wildlife now that

rising profits are encouraging more and more poaching here and abroad.

I feel sure my colleagues in the House join me in urging passage of H.R. 11363.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I too, support this legislation to protect endangered species and to prevent the illegal shipment of wildlife.

The population explosion—with its accompanying requirements for feeding, transporting, and generally accommodating the millions of people who inhabit the earth—has been taking its toll on our wildlife and fish.

Consequently, we now have the problem of endangered species. And as President Nixon said last week in his statement on the population problem, plant and animal resources are also vital. A growing population will increase the demand for such resources. But in many cases the supply will not be increased and may even be endangered.

This bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate in an international effort to protect these endangered species, regardless of the country of origin. Under this legislation animals will now only be brought to the United States for scientific purposes or zoos. In addition, it provides for technical assistance to other countries seeking to protect such vanishing species.

The second section of this bill would aid the States in controlling the interstate shipment of animals caught illegally in this country. The language of this part specifically includes a ban on shipping any part of such animals, with special mention made of reptiles, amphibians, and black bass. This clause aims at reducing the flourishing traffic of poached goods, specifically reptile skins and animal hides.

As this country becomes more affluent, the demand grows for the beautiful goods which can be made from, say, leopard fur or alligator skin. But we must not allow our appreciation for these fine products to overcome our determination to protect the animals from which they come.

Further, the very scarcity of these animals makes their hides more valuable and the profit incentive to the poachers and illegal marketers thus increases. We must do everything possible not only to protect wildlife, but to control this traffic in unlawfully procured animals now being shipped across State lines for commercial uses.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is further proof of our national concern for our natural resources. I am proud of the work the committee has done in this area and am glad to cosponsor this bill.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to protect endangered species, I urge the passage of this important measure.

In this increasingly commercialized and industrialized world, we must protect the original inhabitants, our fish and wildlife, from misuse and possible extinction. Legislation was passed by Congress in 1966 to protect our native American endangered species. As a member of the world community, we must now demonstrate that we are equally concerned about endangered species indigenous to other countries.

Fish and wildlife serve us in many ways, scientific, esthetic, recreational, and commercial. Not too long ago, regulation of the Alaskan fur seal and the sea otter prevented their virtual extinction and, therefore, saved their use for all of these purposes. By the turn of the century, the white-tailed deer was nonexistent in many northeastern States where it once thrived, and now does again because of effective and prompt action.

The regulation and control for which this legislation would provide are needed to protect the base for much industry and merchandising here in this country and abroad. But it will also assure us that our most valuable and enjoyed resources, our fish and wildlife, will not be indiscriminately and recklessly lost through misuse or abuse.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, hunted, trapped and killed, endangered species are facing a crisis of survival. The whooping crane, western bison, grizzly bear, bald eagle, alligator, jaguar, cheetah, leopard, and many other species may only be names in zoology books for the next generation, if my colleagues do not vote for the endangered species bill before the House today.

When I introduced this bill, it was with the knowledge that man has steadily encroached on these animals to the point of extinction. We cannot seem to let the beautiful things exist. We have to stuff them for the den, or skin them for fun furs, or trap them for exotic pets.

The endangered species legislation would prevent the interstate shipment or importation of endangered species. In this way, we would not only protect endangered species in the United States, but we would alleviate wanton destruction of such animals in other countries for sale in the United States.

The provision that the Secretary of the Interior designate the ports of entry, insures that there will be no illegal entry.

The bill also provides funding to the Department of the Interior for the establishment of sanctuaries for these animals.

Destroying our wildlife deserves strong penalties. I commend the committee for their prompt and crucial action on this bill. They have provided strong enforcement provisions and stiff penalties, appropriate to the crime against nature.

I am very encouraged by the committee's report. It indicates a deep realization of this critical issue. Thus, I am confident that the necessity for such legislation is evident, and that this necessary bill will pass the House today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, as the sponsor of an almost identical bill, H.R. 10945, and having supported similar legislation passed by the House in the last Congress.

The legislation before us today not only preserves all species threatened by extinction, which in itself is significant, but the species of particular concern to my State of Florida, the alligator, is part of wondrous nature's means of preserving wildlife. The alligator holes in the Everglades are the principal means of preserving all types of wildlife—large, small, and even microscopic—in times of drought. Without the natural borings of the alligator, much of the wildlife in the

Everglades and other places throughout the world would die and possibly become extinct. The alligator is therefore one of the means by which Mother Nature preserves wildlife and for this reason its preservation is of even greater significance than would appear on the surface.

I was privileged to join Secretary Walter J. Hickel on a recent on-site inspection of the alligator habitat in the Everglades and to make a survey of the Everglades National Park and surrounding areas, which is one of America's most precious natural resources of wildlife. At the rate poachers are killing off the alligator, it will not be too many years before it is extinct if this practice is not stopped. The most direct way to stop poaching is to make the transport and shipping of the alligator hide illegal. This bill accomplishes this.

The Department of Interior is to be congratulated also for beefing up the Park Ranger Service in the Everglades Park area to ferret out and fully prosecute alligator poachers.

The leadership of the Nixon administration in this effort, as evidenced by Secretary Hickel's activities and his personal visitation to Florida, is highly commendable, and I was happy to introduce H.R. 10945 to implement the administration's recommendations to effectively protect the alligator and other endangered species.

Secretary Hickel's testimony on this matter in part, highlighted the problem when he appeared before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee when he said, in recalling information provided by a national park ranger at the Everglades National Park:

One of the park rangers who is the main enforcement officer in a critical area of the park says that his and other people's estimates are that there are about 1,000 poachers active in southern Florida. With drainage and the shrinking of wetlands the alligators are concentrated more and more, and are easier and easier to capture.

It is possible for a poacher to make as much as \$100 in one night's foraging for these skins because raw skins are now bringing \$6 a linear foot. Several of these poachers are said to make \$400 and \$500 a week when they are at this illegal business. The total market for these skins in Miami, the illegal market is in excess of \$1 million. I am quoting these data from this ranger.

The protection service provided by the National Park and by the State game agents is entirely inadequate to significantly check this illegal traffic so that we are getting at the critical point when we are hurting them in the pocketbook.

The Secretary further stated that more law-enforcement officials are needed but they could not alone entirely resolve this problem. He said:

"I think if we had more officials it would help to check this process, but the real problem I believe is the economic problem. If there are means of curbing the market for the sale of such products . . . you get at the profit. Until very recently, well, for centuries, people have lived in the Gulf States and alligators were never threatened. It is only recently when the alligator hides have been used for fashion purposes that the commerce has gone up, and it is the dollar profit that is threatening the species."

This best illustrates the need for this legislation.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 11363. Cur-

rently, birds and wild animals are protected, under section 43 of the United States Code, from hunting and fishing practices that might lead to their extinction. The bill before us today would extend similar protection to reptiles, amphibians, mollusks, and crustaceans.

It would empower the Secretary of Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State and officials of concerned foreign countries, to designate certain species as "endangered species." One year after designation, all importation of these species from a foreign country into the United States would be strictly prohibited. The only exception to this ban would be made for scientific and zoological purposes.

In addition, this bill makes illegal the transportation, delivery, carrying, and shipping for commercial or noncommercial purposes wildlife taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws.

Today, one of the most endangered species is the alligator. Fashion trends have increased the demand for alligator handbags and alligator shoes. As a consequence of this demand, widespread poaching in Florida and other States has resulted.

This species in particular, and all species, in general, must be adequately protected. H.R. 11363, provides necessary protection, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, but I do think there may be some delusion. The Committee on Appropriations of the House has not been going along with the purchase of any inholdings with or without conservation fund money and it is extremely doubtful that anybody is going to get the million dollars a year that is called for in this bill.

If the money is appropriated, and if priority is given to this prescribed purchase, the Members of this body should know that other previously authorized projects will be delayed further. The House should know we are about a half billion dollars behind in acquiring property, the acquisition of which has been authorized by the House.

I would also like to call to the attention of those who are interested in endangered species and wildlife in general to a potential problem that is developing.

There are about 324 fish and wildlife preservation areas in the United States, and under the law those have all been classified to see if they should fit into the wilderness system. The Bureau of Sports, Fishery, and Wildlife has now classified 90 of those areas or parts of the areas for inclusion in wilderness.

When we talk about endangered species, this becomes an especially pertinent subject. Because if land on a game preserve, no matter where it is, is placed in a wilderness, then the fish and wildlife service has obviated an opportunity to build a dam or to provide water or to build a canal or to drain lands and to alter in any respect the natural habitat

which up to this time has been dedicated to the prime purpose of propagating our wildlife species.

I do want to take this opportunity to mention this matter to Members and particularly to the gentleman from Michigan who has such a strong interest in this total subject so that we do not let something happen here that should not happen.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for bringing this matter to my attention.

This is a matter which has begun to trouble me considerably of late.

The distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I have both communicated with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to request that we be consulted with regard to any of these wilderness sites and the fish and wildlife resources involved therewith.

We have received a very friendly and helpful response and we are moving on this with great care and I hope my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, will assist us in this matter in which he is interested.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I believe the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has fully covered the provisions of this bill. I merely wish to add that it has the full bipartisan support of the other members of the committee, and I hope it will have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, any legislation which seeks to protect hundreds of species of fish and wildlife from being exterminated by human exploitation certainly seems worth supporting. This is especially true of H.R. 11363, which seeks to prevent man from obliterating, forever, certain species from the face of the earth.

This legislation proposes to regulate both national and international trade, which is decimating an enormous number of already endangered species.

The American alligator, which is a priceless national heritage, is an excellent example. It will soon disappear forever unless rapid action is taken. The same fate is imminent for other American species, as well as a host of exotic foreign animals, including the rhinoceros, mountain gorilla and many species of the cat family—such as the leopard and jaguar.

It is ironic, but true, that man is the most dangerous game. He is the most destructive predator, and the animals are the victims. This ruthless destruction of the world's wildlife must be stopped.

Basically, H.R. 11363 proposes to attack the problem in two ways: through eliminating the poaching of alligators or other species taken illegally and put in interstate commerce; and through cooperation with affected foreign coun-

tries. In both of these approaches the goal is to remove the market for these animals which are in demand for their furs, hides, and other portions used for wearing apparel or for novelty.

There is another section of H.R. 11363 which I consider to be extremely important. Under existing law, not more than \$750,000 can be used to acquire land in any one area for an endangered species program. I had introduced a separate bill to raise that limit to \$1½ million; later, I encouraged my committee to include an amendment increasing the maximum limit, and this was incorporated into the legislation we are discussing today.

I am convinced this limit should be raised. The Federal Government needs more land to aid its endangered species program and this land should be acquired now—while its cost and availability is within reason.

An excellent example of the need for more land can be found at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, in my own State of Maryland. This installation houses the only wildlife refuge of its kind in the world. Fifteen endangered species of birds and mammals are cared for at Patuxent, and considerable progress is being made in perpetuating valuable species once threatened with extinction. More land is needed at Patuxent, for the erection of breeding pens and for other installations essential to the efficient operation of the endangered species program. This land should be acquired now, while it is available.

A similar need for more land exists at Mason Neck, Va., where a sanctuary is maintained for the bald eagle. This magnificent bird, which is our national emblem, is threatened with extinction along the eastern seaboard. We need to move now to acquire more land to establish valuable roosting and nesting areas, before this land is lost forever to the relentless demands of industrial and commercial development.

There are other areas, in other parts of the country, where land acquisition is needed for our endangered species program. Mr. Speaker, this program and this legislation is designed to protect and preserve valuable species of the animal kingdom, so that they can be enjoyed and appreciated by future generations of people from all parts of the world. I hope that both houses of Congress will recognize this need, and give this legislation the support it needs and deserves.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11363.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM KENTUCKY

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the July 20, 1969, issue of the Washington Post carried an article written by Jack Elsen, one of the staff writers, entitled "Representative NATCHER: Policeman of District of Columbia's Freeways."

My friend, BILL NATCHER, one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, is an outstanding Congressman, and fine citizen. On our committee which has 51 members, we have 13 subcommittee chairmen. Mr. NATCHER serves on three subcommittees—he is No. 2 on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and he is No. 2 on the subcommittee that appropriates the money for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget.

BILL NATCHER is a good committee member and always takes an active part in hearings to develop the facts and in handling in all of the bills from his subcommittees. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture I know that BILL NATCHER fully understands that agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. He further knows that it is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry and is our largest industry. BILL NATCHER further knows that agriculture employs more workers than any other major industry and is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. He understands full well the importance to all our people of soil conservation, research, our extension service, consumer and marketing service, ASCS, REA, and rural telephone, and all of the other departments that make up the Department of Agriculture in this country. Mr. Speaker, we have served together on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture for 15 years. Always he has been an active member of our subcommittee. When we take our bill to the floor each year, Mr. Speaker, we can always depend on BILL NATCHER, because regardless of how much difficulty we experience in presenting our request he will take an active part and will stay there until the last bell sounds taking care of the consumer by providing for the production of food while protecting our national resources.

Mr. Speaker, BILL NATCHER is an active participant in all matters concerning the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is an outstanding member of the subcommittee that makes recommendations for these two departments of our Government. All down through the years WILLIAM H. "BILL" NATCHER has made an excellent member of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Budget and now serves as chairman of this subcommittee. His hearings disclose his knowledge and his dedication to good government.

Mr. Speaker, I include the story entitled "Representative NATCHER: Policeman of District of Columbia's Freeways" in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE NATCHER: POLICEMAN OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FREEWAYS—BOWLING GREEN'S CONGRESSMAN KEEPS MANNING THE ROADBLOCKS

(By Jack Elsen)

Down in Bowling Green, briefly the Confederate capital of Kentucky and now a bustling city of 40,000 ringed by fields of tobacco and corn, easily the best-known local citizen is William Huston Natcher, 59, of 638 East Main St.

The window shades on Natcher's two-story brick Colonial home near the crest of Reservoir Hill are drawn, for he is in Washington attending the afternoon's session of the House of Representatives. You can depend on it. He hasn't missed a roll call since he first won election in 1953. The home folks know it and talk about it.

If you walk into the town square—a tree-shaded park dominated by a fountain decorated with baroque statues of cavorting angels and a flagpole modeled after the Eiffel Tower—anybody will tell you they know Bill Natcher. Known him all their lives. Why, when the favorite nephew won a 4-H prize, Bill even wrote him a letter. Yes, indeed.

Closer questioning discloses however, that in his home town, as in Washington, Bill Natcher is better known for what he does than who he is.

On visits home he will hold court in a store-front office across from the Warren County Courthouse—an office labeled "William H. Natcher, Attorney," although the law practice is dormant.

He also will walk down the street in a whirlwind of handshakes, saying "Hiya partner" to the few whose names he somehow cannot recall.

He is a commanding figure. About six feet tall, slender, with sharp features and piercing eyes, he parts his wavy, gray-streaked hair precisely down the middle. Always regarded as something of a spiffy dresser, he wears conservative suits and bar-type collar clasp.

"I was his laundry delivery boy when I was 16," recalls Deputy Sheriff Charles Forshee, an enthusiastic Natcher supporter. "All I remember is: Go heavy on the starch in the collar and the cuffs."

When home, Natcher will range widely, usually driving alone in his own car, across the rolling green hills of the Second Congressional District, past shanties and modest farm homes. Its 20 counties extend from the Tennessee border 20 miles south of Bowling Green to the banks of the Ohio River 75 miles to the north.

If there is an audience assembled, Natcher will talk to it. Off the political circuit, he shuns social gatherings. He is never seen at the country club. Sometimes he finds time to go fishing with a close friend.

In Washington, where his rise on the House seniority ladder has made him into one of the most powerful men—perhaps the most powerful of all—in municipal affairs, he is rarely seen off Capitol Hill. Since 1961 he has been chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, which passes upon the city budget for the Nation's Capital.

He works evenings, Saturdays, sometimes even Sundays, and never goes to cocktail parties or to other entertainments.

"About all that Bill is interested in is his work," says one Washingtonian who has known him for years.

A nonsmoker and a teetotaler from a district that grows some of the best tobacco and distills some of the most mellow bourbon whiskey in the land, Natcher is known to have but one addiction: peppermints.

Natcher's chief fame from his District Appropriations post stems from his refusal to approve funds for the city's long-sought subway system until the local freeway network, including the controversial Three Sisters Bridge, proceeds "beyond recall."

This has brought down upon him the wrath of those who see subways and freeways as an either/or proposition.

Some Washingtonians, including City Council members who oppose the roads, hope Natcher will relent. But those who know the man, who have watched him at work, insist he is not the kind to change his mind—especially since he has voiced his warning on the subway funds year by year since 1962.

Why has he done this? Some blame it on assumed links with the "highway lobby," the makers of automobiles, refiners of gasoline, manufacturers of cement and builders of roads. They suggest close connections, perhaps campaign contributions.

But Natcher, who routinely wins elections by margins of 2 to 1 (his last one was 3 to 2 in the face of a Nixon sweep of Kentucky and the election of a Republican governor), has reported no contributions received and nominal campaign expenses.

A check indicates no apparent ties with any outside group. He even voted against the Interstate Highway Act in 1955.

"In my opinion," said Circuit Judge Thomas W. Hines, a Republican, in an interview in Bowling Green, "you'll find him just as clean as any man in the U.S. Congress."

The answers more likely lie in Natcher's background and his personal style.

Born into a family of modest means in an isolated town then at the mercy of the politically powerful, Louisville & Nashville Railroad, Natcher grew up in the heyday of the Good Roads Movement.

The catchword was "Get the farmer out of the mud." Natcher's father and grandfather were farmers.

With good roads, Bowling Green blossomed. Interstate Rte. 65, recently opened to Louisville, has helped lure large industrial plants—Firestone, Chrysler Airtemp and Cutler-Hammer among them—to the city's outskirts.

But Bowling Green, which does not even have a local bus system, is not Washington, a point Natcher realizes. The real reasons for his actions on Washington transportation seem to be both political and personal.

The politics could involve old-fashioned log rolling: you do something for me and I'll return the favor.

Natcher wants (and has been amazingly successful in getting) dams, river navigation and flood control projects he believes will bring prosperity to his Second District.

These projects must be authorized by the House Public Works Committee.

It is no coincidence that the same committee has jurisdiction over highways and wants them built in Washington as elsewhere. The same committee originated the Highway Act of 1968, which ordered the city to build Three Sisters and move ahead on other road projects.

Natcher's personal reasons run more deeply.

Natcher, his friends say, has a deep reverence for Congress as an institution, an emotion stronger than whatever political philosophy he may espouse.

His attitude toward Congress is reflected by the detailed personal journal he continues to compile. Its bound volumes, consisting of pages dictated and typed daily without fail, line the shelves of his Capitol Hill office.

Put in the bluntest terms, Natcher is said to believe that once Congress has laid down a mandate to Washington, the city government has no choice but to carry it out.

In other areas of city financing, Natcher is privately regarded by local officialdom as tough-minded but fair, if at times narrow in viewpoint. When he rejects desired programs, he usually cites the need for a balanced budget. (He does have the power to recommend a higher Federal payment.)

Natcher's political ambitions began early

in life. Mayor Robert D. Graham of Bowling Green, a Natcher crony who used to operate the Helm Hotel on the town square, recalls young Bill sitting in the lobby at the age of 16 telling hotel guests that someday he would go to Congress. At 17 he became a Democratic worker in the tough Hendricks Tobacco Barn Precinct.

Natcher attended local schools and Western Kentucky State College, which occupies a hilltop at the south end of town, then borrowed money and worked to put himself through the Ohio State University law school.

Returning home in 1934, he began to practice law. In his first year he earned a \$10,000 fee—and nailed down a reputation—by successfully defending an accused murderer.

Returning to politics, he won statewide attention as president of the Young Democrats. In 1937—the year he married Virginia Reardon, a local beauty and daughter of an affluent physician—he was elected county attorney.

Natcher served as a Navy officer in World War II, meantime retaining his local office under a unique Kentucky law. In 1951 he moved up to commonwealth's attorney, or prosecutor, for a two-county circuit.

County Jailer Raymond McClard, who served as coroner under Natcher, recalls him as a stern but fair prosecutor. Some others are less charitable. One local observer contended that in arguing cases he played to the gallery, his eye always on his political future.

Natcher made his first move toward Congress in 1947 when Second District Rep. Earle C. Clements moved into the Governor's chair. Natcher was outflanked by John A. Whitaker.

After Whitaker died in office, Natcher was outflanked again by Garrett L. Withers, who died in 1953. Mayor Graham acknowledges that he went to Clements, then a U.S. Senator who was boss of the dominant wing of Kentucky's Democratic Party, to win clearance for Natcher. Natcher was nominated by a district convention and won election without Republican opposition.

"They never sent a Congressman from the Second District of Kentucky who wanted to come up here as bad as I did," Natcher told a correspondent for the Louisville Courier-Journal, who found him informal, talkative and frank.

As Natcher made his way into the inner circle of the House establishment by hard work, attention to detail and largely a party-line voting pattern, his superficial graciousness with newsmen remained intact.

But any tendency toward being talkative is now kept severely in check. He is thin-skinned, say some who know him, and he has not liked some of the things reporters and editorial writers have written about him. He declined to be interviewed for this article.

Perhaps his severest critic has been the Courier-Journal, a paper more liberal in tone than the back country of Kentucky in which it circulates widely.

An editor of that paper said Natcher, by his conservative fiscal views and votes in opposition to civil rights legislation, "does not represent Kentucky."

A random sampling of Bowling Green residents indicates, however, that he reflects his Southern-oriented district's views pretty well.

As an inside operative in Congress, Natcher has rarely been widely identified with major national legislation.

A dramatic and timely exception was in 1958 when Natcher, then chairman of a House space subcommittee, helped manage the bill that created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He predicted during debate that, given adequate financing, the program could put a man on the moon by 1966.

If Natcher faces any future political threat, it could come from the growth of rampant conservatism around Owensboro, the district's largest city, or the recent redrawing of his district's lines to push against the outskirts of Louisville.

Rarely if ever does Natcher send out mimeographed press releases or newsletters. But he peppers district newspapers, broadcasting stations and officials with telegrams describing the goodies he, by implication, has delivered or can provide.

And his letters of congratulations for awards, births and marriages, of condolences for deaths and illnesses are legend. Sometimes they find their way into adjacent districts. The political fallout is all in Natcher's favor.

"Sometimes folks criticize him for not getting up and fighting, for not making a lot of noise like some of the other Congressmen do," said a shirtsleeved workman slugging beer from a bottle in Simpson's Billiard Parlor. "As I look at it, he's a quiet cat and not a noisy cat. That's Bill Natcher."

GALLUP POLL SUGGESTS FEDERAL AID TO CHILD CENTERS

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the task force on education and training established by the House Republican research committee recognizes the growing national awareness that adequate day-care facilities and programs are needed. The extent of this nationwide concern is reflected in a recent Gallup poll, published in the New York Times on July 13, 1969. It indicates that two out of every three adults in this country favor the use of Federal funds to establish day-care centers across the Nation.

During the coming months, a large portion of the task force's energies will be devoted to investigating not only the day-care problems but also the larger concern of early childhood education. Psychologists and educators tell us that the earliest years of a child's life may well be the most important in determining his future accomplishments. Early childhood education is a concern that cuts across the total fabric of our society, but it is of deepest concern to the economically and culturally deprived who cannot take for granted that their children will receive either the relevant educational experiences or the proper physical attention needed to realize their potential.

The article follows:

POLL SUGGESTS AID TO CHILD CENTERS—GALLUP SAYS 64 PERCENT BACK USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS

PRINCETON, N.J., July 12.—Almost two out of every three adults favor the use of Federal funds to set up day-care centers for children in communities across the nation, according to the latest Gallup Poll.

"I'm all in favor of day-care centers for children, a 25-year-old social worker from Brooklyn said.

"Mothers complain to me that they can't take a job because there's no place to leave their children. And they don't want to leave them with neighbors because they can't be sure what will happen to them during the day."

"Furthermore," he added, "kids gain from these centers—they get away from what

goes on in underprivileged areas and they receive training that will help them later."

JOBS FOR MOTHERS

The centers would give mothers a chance to get jobs or job training and would provide greater educational opportunities for younger children.

Now almost all day-care centers in the nation are privately run and are operated by corporations or by trade and community groups, both on a profit and nonprofit basis. There is little Federal funding of daycare centers, except for a few experimental projects.

Negroes interviewed in the survey were enthusiastic about the proposal. A 23-year-old Los Angeles Negro, whose yearly income is \$5,000 and who has a wife and seven children, commented about the centers:

"They couldn't help but be beneficial to both the mother and children. They would permit the mother to work and give young children a chance to get some education."

In the survey, 1,551 persons were interviewed between June 20 and 23. They were given the following explanation and question:

"Day care centers for very young children are being set up so that mothers living in poor areas can take jobs and so that the children can get early educational training. How do you feel about this—would you favor or oppose having the Federal Government provide funds to set up these centers in most communities?"

Negroes and persons living in the largest cities were most in favor of the proposal. Those who opposed the proposal often did so on the grounds that it would add to the taxpayer's burden.

The national results and results of the poll by key groups follow:

	Favor (percent)	Oppose (percent)	No opinion (percent)
National.....	64	30	6
Men.....	59	34	6
Women.....	68	27	5
Whites.....	63	32	5
Negroes.....	77	11	6
21 to 28 years.....	63	21	2
29 to 39 years.....	63	32	5
40 and over.....	60	32	8
Community Size			
500,000 and over.....	70	23	7
50,000 to 500,000.....	67	29	4
2,500 to 50,000.....	58	38	4
Under 2,500.....	58	34	7

¹ Based on the 9 percent of Negro adults included in the sample.

MOON MISSION ACCOMPLISHED—PROBLEMS ON EARTH REMAIN

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, two American astronauts set foot on the surface of the moon last night as the representatives of all mankind. They are a living example of the capability of human technological resources to do the seemingly impossible. It is also apparent that without the greatest resource of all, the drive and determination of the human spirit, none of this could have been accomplished.

With the incredible success the space program has attained and with the belief that it will continue this success, we must now turn our faces downward to the solving of the problems on earth. Can we not transfer our desire for ex-

ploration of space to the troubles we have at home? They are, in comparison, very simple. We do not have to contend with a foreign environment or unknown dangers. We have simply to house and feed the poor, clean the air and water, control a booming population, and end armed hostilities. Cannot we apply a perfectly executed program like the Apollo mission to saving our cities and curing deadly diseases. We have the objectives and the programs, we need a concentrated effort. It is now time for a revitalization of programs and rededication of action to achieve our goals. When we know that it is possible to explore outer space and the moon and open a new world for posterity, certainly we can improve the old world.

The kind of cooperative effort that a space program demands must be applied to domestic and international actions for the improvement of the peoples and environment of this earth.

In the words of John Ruskin, a 19th-century writer:

The highest reward for man's toil is not what he gets for it, but what he becomes by it.

The landing on the moon of an American space vehicle was a universal triumph which reflects upon each human being. By our "toil" we must now become a nation and world dedicated to assuring the well-being of all mankind.

AEC AND ITS CONTRACTORS PLAY EXPANDING ROLE IN MANNED SPACE MISSIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the unique capabilities developed in connection with nuclear energy, the Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors throughout the United States are being called upon to play an expanding role in manned space missions.

A heater system, using radioactive plutonium-238 produced at the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River plant, in South Carolina, is built into a seismometer which Apollo 11 astronauts will leave upon the moon. The two heaters, fabricated by the Atomic Energy Commission's Mound Laboratory, Miamisburg, Ohio, will protect the moonquake recorder during the long frigid lunar nights. Radiation from the plutonium-238 produces the heat for the device.

When the Apollo 11 astronauts obtain the first lunar surface samples, they will be dug with a scoop designed and fabricated by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The lunar samples will be placed in two vacuum-tight containers called moon boxes, which were designed and fabricated at the Commission's Oak Ridge Y-12 plant.

And later, the lunar materials will undergo extensive physical and biological testing at an underground laboratory at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex. The low-level radiation-counting laboratory at the Center is based upon an environmental control

system designed, built, and tested by Y-12. For some of the tests, a special spectrometer developed by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory will be used.

When scientists examine the first "dust" brought back from the moon, one of the tests will be to determine whether any form of life is present. An expert in the special technique to be used in testing for biological content, Dr. M. G. Hann, Jr., an experimental pathologist at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and a consultant to NASA, will oversee use of germ-free mice for this experiment.

Lunar samples will also be analyzed at the following AEC installations: Argonne National Laboratory, near Chicago; Battelle's Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Hanford, Wash.; the University of California's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore and Berkeley; and the Idaho Nuclear Corp., Idaho Falls. Dr. Luis Alvarez of the University of California will study some of the samples in his investigations of the moon's magnetic fields.

The AEC's Idaho Operations Office has been supporting both manned and unmanned lunar and planetary programs under contract with NASA, dating back to May 1966. The work, assigned to Idaho Nuclear Corp., has involved setting up at NASA's Houston Lunar Receiving Laboratory highly sophisticated techniques utilizing gamma ray spectrometry for measuring and analyzing moon dust samples.

Supervising the work under two AEC-NASA contracts is Idaho Nuclear's Russell Heath, international authority on the spectrometry of radioisotopes and nuclide decay schemes.

The AEC's Atomic International facility in the Santa Susana hills of California played a key role in quality control and acceptance testing and neutron radiography of more than 500 ordnance items in the Apollo command service module. AI developed and supplied the cold plates which remove heat from the batteries, generators, and transformers aboard the Apollo spacecraft. The cold plates are based upon reactor fuel technology developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Atomic International also supplied the counterweights of depleted uranium for the Apollo launch escape system.

Recently the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant designed and fabricated a "space wrench"—an open end flat ratchet wrench currently being evaluated for possible use by astronauts in space.

The first lunar excursion module docking device, a one-third scale working model, was fabricated at this same gaseous diffusion plant, and was used by NASA in testing prior to construction of the full-scale operational device.

Looking into the future, when the Apollo 12 astronauts make the second manned lunar landing, they will place an AEC-developed atomic-fueled generator—known as SNAP-27—on the lunar surface where it will become the first long-life day and night power station on the moon. Its electrical output will be used to run a series of several automated scientific experiments which will operate for at least a year, and to power the radio transmitter used to beam results of the experiments back to earth.

The fuel in the generator will be plutonium-238, also from the Savannah River plant, operated for the Atomic Energy Commission by the Du Pont Co.

The broad spectrum of capabilities of the AEC and its contractors proves of service to the Nation's space program and in achieving many other national goals. As a nation we are fortunate from the foresight of those who developed these great multidisciplinary national institutions.

GOV. LESTER MADDOX OF GEORGIA ON FREEDOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in times of crisis, a leader has always appeared to guide the people.

Today unelected bureaucrats swarm over our land, disrupting society, creating tensions and provoking hostilities.

The narrow-minded egomaniacs would destroy every freedom which interferes with their ideas of what is good for us.

No more important freedom could exist than the God-given right of a parent to defend and protect his child and to see that he is educated and grows up according to the ideals and principles of his parents. Even the Supreme Court upheld this view in disallowing school prayer for the benefit of an atheist's child.

Today, all over our country, but most especially in the South, parents are being denied the right to have any voice in the selection of a school for their children. This tragic educational totalitarianism has been forced upon our people by a Federal court bureaucracy which would defy humanity, reason, laws, and even the Constitution itself, by holding freedom to be illegal unless the people use that freedom to establish a social order which the people do not want but the bureaucrats do. Parents are told that they are perfectly free to do as they are told.

The leadership in the battle to regain individual liberty under our Constitution and God, and to preserve education, has now been thrust upon Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia. He has accepted his role with a fervent dedication to do whatever is necessary to dramatize the lack of public confidence and support in the ever-expanding bureaucratic dictatorship which seeks to engulf us all.

I join with millions of my fellow countrymen in recognizing Governor Maddox's struggle for right and include a copy of his letter of July 11 to the President of the United States, his reply to the HEW ultimatum, and his position on the consolidation and closing of schools and busing of schoolchildren in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, July 11, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Along with countless other Americans, I appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam, restore peace on our college campuses, make safe the

streets of American cities, snuff out the flame of inflation and stem the flow of obscene materials in our malls. These are goals which should receive the total support of every patriotic citizen of the United States.

However, it is my judgment that these goals cannot be reached until Federal control of education is relinquished and the control of public education is returned to local citizens and their local governments and local systems of education.

Federal participation in education, once hailed as a progressive step, has evolved into a Federal dictatorship over our public systems of education, and the rights of the several states and their local citizens to control the institutions which they have set up to educate their children have been unconstitutionally denied.

The obvious, and generally acknowledged, result of Federal interference in public education is chaos, confusion, disruption and an overall lowering of the standard of education, available to all children, both white and nonwhite. The philosophy which currently prevails with most Federal officials who are charged with determining educational policies is one which places social reform far ahead of the safety, welfare, health and economic security of our children, their teachers, their parents and their communities.

Innocent and helpless children, without regard to race, are to suffer. Hundreds of communities are left without schools and without industrial and economic development opportunities, and the investments of teachers, parents and others in their schools, homes and businesses, in many instances, are all but destroyed.

American citizens are being denied the "freedom of choice" which is the nucleus of the freedoms for which Americans have fought and died, and for which, even today, our young men in uniform are giving their all.

I am sure that you, yourself, have observed that, as Federal control of education has increased, there has been a corresponding increase in crime, disorder, violence, attacks on teachers and students (both in and out of school), disrespect for the U.S. government and for its flag, disrespect for law and order and for the rights of our citizens.

In order to counter this grave threat to the very survival of the United States as "one nation, under God," it is necessary to immediately relinquish the Federal stranglehold on public education in the United States and return this control to the proper local governments, local institutions and to the local citizens.

In 1968, you stated:

"Federal aid to education has been necessary, and I have supported it. But, I draw the line on one point. If we're going to have Federal aid to education, it is the responsibility of those at the national level, and particularly the President of the United States, to see that Federal control does not follow. We want federal aid and local control."

Mr. President, in the name of what is right and what is American, I beg of you to follow through on your promises, both implicit and explicit, to the American people that you would remove public education from the death grip of unknowledgeable and unfeeling Federal bureaucracies.

In my judgment, success in this most worthy endeavor would represent an accomplishment the significance of which has never been surpassed by any other President of the United States in the history of this great nation.

I pray that you will give this matter the full consideration which the vast majority of your constituents would insist that it deserves.

Respectfully,

LESTER MADDOX,
Governor.

RESPONSE BY GOVERNOR LESTER MADDOX TO THE HEW ULTIMATUM ISSUED TO THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, JULY 10, 1969

It is a sad and tragic time for Georgia and her children and for the parents and children throughout this great land. It is not a question of "segregation" and "integration;" it is a question of education and what must be done to turn back a very real threat to the safety and welfare and liberty of our children, their parents, their teachers and their communities.

Those in our federal government who brought about the issuance of this ultimatum, either knowingly or unwittingly, are carrying out the plans outlined by the Communist Party U.S.A. some forty years ago, and demanded even now by the communist enemies of America. Those in our federal government who know of the communist demands and then support or do not oppose such an ultimatum do not deserve to be in public office in this country, and those who insisted upon this ultimatum who are not knowledgeable of the communist involvement also should be removed from public office.

HEW has demonstrated time and time again that they have no interest whatsoever in the education of this nation's children; they care no more about our children, black or white, than they care about the rubble in the streets. Their one and only aim is to promote social reform, regardless of the costs in human suffering.

I predicted back in the Mid-fifties, and it is a matter of public record, that if the federal government continued to wrest control of education from local citizens and their local officials, we would have a lowering of the level of education in this country, that our children and their teachers would be subjected to attacks, that we would have to put armed policemen in school hallways and classrooms to keep the peace, that property would be wrecked and destroyed and that there would be crime, disorder and violence in our schools such as we had never before witnessed in the United States of America.

Regretfully, each and every one of these predictions have come true, and, now, not satisfied with the chaos, confusion and heartache which they have already caused, HEW officials, with the implied consent of the President, the Congress and the U.S. Supreme Court, are attempting to bring about their destruction of education in America in a wholesale, rather than piecemeal, fashion.

I say that those leaders in the White House, in Congress, in the Supreme Court and in state and local offices throughout this nation who know (and all able and patriotic officeholders should know) of the plans of the communists to wreck and ruin public education through federal control of education and thus overthrow our republic, and yet allow the heel of the federal tyrant to be crushed into the faces of our children, then, in my judgment, they are dishonorable cowards who are not deserving of the great trust placed in them by their constituents.

HEW is allowed to issue an ultimatum to the free citizens of Georgia and other sister states, demanding that we surrender our children and our basic human and American right to freedom of choice, but top officials in our national government do not have the guts, courage and love for country required to issue an ultimatum to the enemies of this country in North Vietnam where even now we have lost some forty thousand young Americans and injured, crippled and blinded more than two hundred thousand of our finest young men fighting a war the way our communist enemies demand that it be fought.

They would not dare to issue an ultimatum cutting off "anti-poverty" and other federal funds that are used to employ, encourage

and finance the anarchists, criminals, communists, bums and parasites who wreck, burn and loot our cities, shoot down law enforcement officers and law-abiding merchants and other peaceful citizens, and disrupt and destroy our college campuses throughout much of this country. They just simply are not American enough to cut off these who are following the dictates of those in Russia and Red China who have sworn to destroy and take over the United States of America.

These same officials who say surrender your children (non-white and white) and their education to us, or we will cut off funds needed for books, schoolrooms, teachers and food, do not have the courage and patriotism required to call a halt to federal dollars being used to feed, house, clothe, and finance those who spread communism, both in this country and abroad.

Of all the billions of dollars ever to flow into Washington and those billions that will flow there later, their value is nothing compared to the value of our children, their education, their safety and welfare and the liberty of us all. Regardless of the cowardice of our leaders in Washington and the demands of the communists, our position of placing our children ahead of dollars, votes, politics and communism will be upheld.

I don't have too much of a life left; I have lived almost 54 years of it, so the future of Lester Maddox is not important. But there are children in this State and in this country who have their whole lives ahead of them, and I intend to do all within my power, whatever the cost, to see that they have a chance to live in a free nation. To do less would require that I join with the cowards who would rather be elected than be right.

This threat to one of the most basic freedoms of our people, that of "freedom of choice", must be turned back, and whether I have fifteen more minutes or fifteen more years to live, I will spend every minute of that time in an effort to restore to our people their right to determine educational policies at the local level and, in so doing, help to preserve America as a free republic.

I have no direct authority in this matter; nevertheless, I am recommending that the State Board of Education proceed as it has in the past by providing our people, both black and white, freedom of choice. I, for one, will not stand by and fall to fight with all that is within me those who demand that our children, their teachers and our communities be subjected to the illegal dictates of federal bureaucracies which neither know, nor care, about the educational needs of Georgia's citizens. I consider forced integration and forced segregation to be equally illegal and unconstitutional. The God-given right of freedom of choice for every parent, every teacher and every child must be restored.

We law-abiding citizens and our children are asking for no more than our federal government now extends to our communist enemies, both within and without this nation. Surely our national government will not continue to deny to us what it so freely affords our enemies.

We are asking for no more than Mr. Nixon assured us would be ours when he said, "If we're going to have federal aid to education, it is the responsibility of those at the national level, and particularly the President of the United States, to see that federal control does not follow. We want federal aid and local control."

We are asking for the federal aid and local control as Mr. Nixon said the President of the United States should provide. It is the American way and, without it, America will fall.

Regardless of what course others may take, I have stated my position and will not forsake it, even if I am the first to go to jail or if my life is required of me.

Our schools need every dollar they can get, but if the federal government insists

upon its position that we decide between millions of federal dollars and our children, their education and their liberty, then my choice will be Georgia's children.

POSITION ON CONSOLIDATION AND CLOSING OF SCHOOLS AND BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN
(By Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia)

To: *Officials of State and Local Boards of Education, Educators and Georgia Parents:*

In the sincere belief that many of the ever-increasing problems in local systems of education have resulted from the forced implementation of cruel, unreasonable, unconstitutional and patently illegal guidelines and demands by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and believing, further, that rather than benefitting any particular person, group or community, as these guidelines are alleged to do, that they, instead, have brought, and will continue to bring, irreparable harm to our local systems of education, to our teachers, to our parents, to our communities, and, most regrettably, to the children of this State who have no choice but to accept whatever we provide for them, whether it is good or bad.

I feel that the seriousness of the situation which confronts us demands that I make known my opinions, although I am well aware that my position as Governor does not grant me any special authority in matters dealing with policies of education either at the State or local level.

However, it is my judgment that schools and grade levels, which are not able to enroll what has been determined to be a minimum number of students, should not be closed, nor the students be transferred to other districts or to other cities, if the schools and grade levels can be demonstrated to be growing, or at least not losing students. To close such schools and to transfer these students represents a total disregard for the best interests of the students, their parents, the teachers and the communities.

To bring about the closing of schools in order to comply with the socialistic philosophies of those in H.E.W., in Moscow, and elsewhere, thus sacrificing an entire generation of our children, their education and their communities is, in my opinion, a criminal and unconstitutional act by government and by the educators responsible for such actions.

It has been observed that, through the inaction of education officials, some schools have been allowed to deteriorate to an intolerable degree and, then, the dilapidated condition of these schools has been used by these same officials to justify the closing of the schools.

The closing of a school through such devious means or under the pretext that reduced enrollments demand such action, when, in fact, such reductions have been deliberately caused by the busing of children out of their own school district to attend schools in other districts, represents cruel and unjust treatment of all the children, parents, teachers and other members of the communities thus discriminated against.

In the same light, to bus children of several grades out of their home communities to schools in a foreign community or even in another city, solely for the purpose of promoting social reform, with total disregard for the education and well-being of our children of every race and color, is, also, in my judgment, a criminal and unconstitutional act.

The closing and destroying of schools to promote racial integration disrupts, and sometimes even destroys, communities and places such integration ahead of the education and well-being of both black and white students.

It is criminal and unconstitutional to deny black and white teachers and students "freedom of choice" in determining where they will teach or attend school. Federal and States laws permit citizens "freedom of

choice" in training and protecting their pets and animals, and officials at any level of government or education who deny "freedom of choice" to parents in determining how best to train and protect their children are knowingly, or unwittingly, committing a criminal and unconstitutional act against these parents and their children.

It is my position that any actions detrimental to the health, education and welfare of Georgia's children, especially as outlined in this paper, must be halted, even if such action results in the loss of millions of dollars in federal aid. Georgia's children, both black and white, and their education, safety and well-being are worth more than all the federal dollars this State has ever received, or will ever receive.

It is an obvious fact that we need all the money we can get for the education of our children, but if we are required to sacrifice our children as helpless and innocent pawns of the socialists in order to obtain federal dollars, then we should forget the dollars and place our children's education and welfare ahead of all else.

In addition to the harm brought to our children by unnecessary busing of students and the unnecessary closing and consolidation of schools, there are also important economic considerations which are worthy of your attention.

Such actions destroy the industrial potential and economic well-being of a community. Industry will not go into a community where a school has been closed or where unfavorable conditions of education have developed in a community as a result of school consolidation.

It is no less than stealing from the taxpayers when the schools they have bought (or are buying) are closed to please the socialists and communists.

To close such schools without educational justification, when citizens have moved into communities and made investments in their homes, businesses, churches, and other properties, is also stealing from our fellow citizens.

While we are all fully aware that the Governor of Georgia has no authority in matters relating to policy and regulations governing the operation of Georgia schools, I do feel that it is incumbent upon me as an elected official and as a citizen of this State, to call upon the educators at State and local levels of government to place our children ahead of the socialists' demands to bus Georgia children and close Georgia schools for the sole purpose of promoting social reform. To ignore this problem, and to continue to disregard the cries for help from Georgia parents and children of all races, would be to forsake our duty and responsibility as citizens, as educators and as public officials.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on behalf of myself and 68 other Members of Congress, I called for the restoration of the large cuts in Federal aid to education and libraries, recommended by the Nixon administration.

The recommendation came in the form of a letter to the chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, Hon. DANIEL FLOOD. In that letter we declared that a failure to restore the Nixon cuts would result in a 66-percent cut in Federal aid to libraries—from \$135 million to \$46 million—and a 25-percent cut in the budget of the Office of Education—from

\$4 billion to \$3.3 billion—from fiscal 1968 levels.

The administration recommended the elimination of any money for the elementary and secondary school libraries program—title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which provides money for the purchase of books for children in public and private schools. It calls for the 50-percent cut of funds for grants for public libraries under title I of the Library Services and Construction Act. And it calls for a 33-percent reduction in funds for programs to make education more relevant and individualized through programs of supplemental services under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Since this question will be before the Democratic caucus on Wednesday, and before the floor next Monday, I am inserting, following my statement, a comparison of fiscal 1968 appropriations for selected education and library programs with the amounts recommended by the Nixon administration for fiscal 1970.

There is something basically hypocritical about an administration which preaches self-help and then grabs away the books and educational programs which would allow those who want to, to better themselves.

If the funds are not restored, the effect of these cuts on the education and library programs of this country will be devastating. The impact on New York City offers a good example. It would mean that hours and staffing at many local libraries would have to be cut. It would end programs of service to low-income communities which provide preschool Headstart type, dropout, and adult reading and education programs to over 1.2 million in the south Bronx and north Manhattan areas. It would prevent the establishment of a third program of educational and library services to low-income communities contemplated for the Lower East Side.

The letter and comparison of education and library appropriations follow:

JULY 18, 1969.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, Appropriations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We are writing to urge you to recommend that the Appropriations Committee restore the huge cuts in Federal aid to education and aid to libraries recommended by the Nixon Administration. At the very least, they should be restored to their fiscal 1968 level. If they are not, the budget of the Office of Education will be 25% below its 1968 level, and library allocations will be down 66% from the same year.

There is something inherently wrong with a sense of national priorities which can allocate over \$80 billion to defend a society in which less than \$3.3 billion in Federal money is being spent for the education of all its 60 million school children and the many millions more who seek to up-lift themselves.

If these cuts are approved, it will impoverish our school libraries, our college libraries, and our public libraries, and choke off other education programs on all levels.

Our elementary and secondary school libraries, with their open range of books, films, and mini-laboratories, are getting our kids excited about learning more than the old regimented methods ever did. There are still 40,000 schools without their own libraries,

and teachers in these schools have been pleading for them. Yet the new budget cuts them off without a penny, providing for absolutely no funding for Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The proposal will knock the wind out of the new missionary libraries—little collections of books that have been going to the people where they live, in urban slums and rural wildernesses. These missionary libraries help preschool children from illiterate homes, and migrant workers and people on welfare who would like to get themselves a decent job. It would cut in half the fiscal 1969 allocation for Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act.

And finally, the recommended cuts will seriously hamper programs to make education both more relevant and individualized by cutting by one-third the funds for supplemental services under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By reducing library allocations from fiscal 1968's level of \$135 million to \$46 million, the proposed cuts would trim the Federal budget by 1/20 of one percent. Meanwhile, in spite of this achievement, the Federal budget would still be up \$8 billion over last year.

The proposal then is as futile in saving money as it is destructive to social progress and human lives. We call upon the committee to squarely face the challenges of America's future and to restore the educational and library budgets.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNATORIES TO LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN
FLOOD

Leonard Farbstein, Democrat of New York.
Joseph Addabbo, Democrat of New York.
Glenn M. Anderson, Democrat of California.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat of New York.

Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat of New York.

John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana.
George E. Brown, Jr., Democrat of Colorado.

Daniel E. Button, Democrat of New York.
Hugh L. Carey, Democrat of New York.
Tim Lee Carter, Republican of Kentucky.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat of New York.
William Clay, Democrat of Missouri.
Jeffery Cohelan, Democrat of California.
John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan.
James C. Corman, Democrat of California.
John Culver, Democrat of Iowa.
Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat of Connecticut.

Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat of New Jersey.

John D. Dingell, Democrat of Michigan.
Harold D. Donohue, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Don Edwards, Democrat of California.
Joshua Ellberg, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
Michael A. Feighan, Democrat of Ohio.
Hamilton Fish, Jr., Republican of New York.

Donald M. Fraser, Democrat of Minnesota.
Samuel N. Friedel, Democrat of Maryland.
James G. Fulton, Republican of Pennsylvania.

Richard Fulton, Democrat of Tennessee.
Nick Galifianakis, Democrat of North Carolina.

Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat of Maryland.

Joseph M. Gaydos, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Henry B. Gonzalez, Democrat of Texas.
Lee H. Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana.

Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia.
Henry Helstoski, Democrat of New Jersey.

Frank Horton, Republican of New York.

William L. Hungate, Democrat of Missouri.
Harold T. Johnson, Democrat of California.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat of New York.
Peter N. Kyros, Democrat of Maine.
Allard K. Lowenstein, Democrat of New York.

Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat of Hawaii.
Martin B. McKneally, Republican of New York.

Lloyd Meeds, Democrat of Washington.
John Melcher, Democrat of Montana.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.

Joseph G. Minish, Democrat of New Jersey.
Robert H. Mollohan, Democrat of West Virginia.

F. Bradford Morse, Republican of Massachusetts.

John E. Moss, Democrat of California.
William T. Murphy, Democrat of Illinois.
Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Arnold Olsen, Democrat of Montana.
Claude Pepper, Democrat of Florida.

Bertram L. Podell, Democrat of New York.
Thomas M. Rees, Democrat of California.
Ogden R. Reid, Republican of New York.

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.

Edward R. Roybal, Democrat of California.
William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York.
William L. St. Onge, Democrat of Connecticut.

James H. Scheuer, Democrat of New York.
Louis Stokes, Democrat of Ohio.

James Symington, Democrat of Missouri.
Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.

John V. Tunney, Democrat of California.
Lester L. Wolff, Democrat of New York.

Gus Yatron, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—HISTORY OF 1970 BUDGET, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970 HISTORY, I

	Fiscal year 1969				Fiscal year 1970			
	Fiscal year 1968 appropriation	Authorization ¹	Appropriation ²	Authorization ¹	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education.....	\$1,667,213,000	\$3,249,059,274	\$1,475,993,000	\$3,612,054,470	\$1,553,855,000	\$1,558,327,000	\$1,525,876,000	\$1,415,393,000
School assistance in federally affected areas.....	529,602,000	640,112,000	521,253,000	701,593,000	458,502,000	315,167,000	315,167,000	202,167,000
Education professions development.....	0	352,500,000	95,000,000	445,000,000	146,500,000	116,500,000	105,000,000	95,000,000
Teacher Corps.....	13,500,000	46,000,000	20,900,000	56,000,000	31,100,000	31,100,000	31,100,000	31,100,000
Higher education.....	1,155,682,000	1,689,428,706	815,444,000	1,981,700,000	1,204,372,000	1,071,188,000	897,259,000	780,839,000
Vocational education.....	262,900,000	482,100,000	248,216,000	766,650,000	444,570,000	350,216,000	279,216,000	279,216,000
Libraries and community services.....	156,500,000	275,300,000	147,144,000	425,100,000	179,675,000	168,375,000	155,625,000	107,709,000
Education for the handicapped.....	53,400,000	243,125,000	79,795,000	321,500,000	111,500,000	100,000,000	85,850,000	85,850,000
Research and training.....	90,967,000	35,000,000	87,452,000	56,000,000	161,755,000	113,200,000	90,000,000	115,000,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	15,700,000	56,050,000	18,165,000	120,000,000	29,500,000	24,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Research and training (special foreign currency).....	0	Indefinite	1,000,000	Indefinite	7,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	37,520,000	Indefinite	40,804,512	Indefinite	58,412,000	46,725,000	43,375,000	43,375,000
Civil rights education.....	10,000,000	Indefinite	10,797,000	Indefinite	16,500,000	13,800,000	13,750,000	20,000,000
College for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.....	2,550,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,650,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Promotion of Vocational Education Act, Feb. 23, 1917.....	1,161,000	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455	7,161,455
Student loan insurance fund.....	0	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	400,000,000	104,875,000	400,000,000	154,800,000	54,509,000	4,509,000	4,509,000
Total.....	4,006,418,000	7,479,682,435	3,676,599,967	8,895,358,925	4,579,178,455	3,987,694,455	3,591,314,455	3,221,745,455

¹ Includes indefinite authorizations.

² 1969 appropriation adjusted for comparability with 1970 appropriation structure.

³ Includes proposed supplementals.

Source: Budget and Manpower Division, Apr. 9, 1969.

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970, II—SELECTED FIGURES

Appropriation/activity	Fiscal year 1969				Fiscal year 1970			
	Fiscal 1969 appropriation	Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education:								
Educationally deprived children (ESEA-I).....	\$1,186,873,000	\$2,184,436,274	\$1,123,127,000	\$2,359,554,470	\$1,171,500,000	\$1,226,127,000	\$1,226,000,000	\$1,226,000,000
Local educational agencies (ESEA-I).....	(2,072,075,264)	(1,020,438,980)	(2,238,402,205)	(1,061,414,905)	(1,115,347,932)	(1,115,222,202)	(1,115,222,202)	(1,115,222,202)
Handicapped children (ESEA-I).....	(29,781,258)	(29,781,258)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)	(32,128,027)
Juvenile delinquents in institutions (ESEA-I).....	(12,459,014)	(12,459,014)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)	(13,518,269)
Dependent and neglected children in institutions (ESEA-I).....	(1,487,086)	(1,487,086)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)	(1,564,245)
Migratory children (ESEA-I).....	(45,556,074)	(45,556,074)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)	(49,214,654)
State administration (ESEA-I).....	(23,077,578)	(13,404,588)	(24,727,070)	(13,659,900)	(14,353,873)	(14,352,603)	(14,352,603)	(14,352,603)
Dropout prevention (ESEA-VII).....	0	30,000,000	5,000,000	30,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Bilingual education (ESEA-VII).....	0	30,000,000	7,500,000	40,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Supplementary educational centers (ESEA-III).....	182,810,000	527,875,000	164,876,000	566,500,000	214,000,000	172,000,000	172,876,000	116,393,000
Library resources (ESEA-II).....	99,085,000	167,375,000	50,000,000	206,000,000	41,400,000	46,000,000	42,000,000	0

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970, II—SELECTED FIGURES—Continued

Appropriation/activity	Fiscal year 1969				Fiscal year 1970			
	Fiscal 1969 appropriation	Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Estimate to Department	Department estimate to Budget Bureau	Johnson budget	Nixon amendments
Elementary and secondary education—Continued								
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V-A)...	\$24,460,000	\$25,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$19,800,000	\$18,000,000	\$12,000,000	0
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA-III)...	77,883,000	204,373,000	78,740,000	290,000,000	16,155,000	17,950,000	0	0
Grants to States		(96,800,000)	(75,740,000)	(105,600,000)	(13,155,000)	0	0	0
Loans to nonprofit private schools		(13,200,000)	(1,000,000)	(14,400,000)	(1,000,000)	0	0	0
State administration		¹ (10,000,000)	(2,000,000)	¹ (10,000,000)	(2,000,000)	0	0	0
Grants to local educational agencies		(84,373,000)	0	(160,000,000)	0	(17,950,000)	0	0
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA-V)	29,457,000	80,000,000	29,750,000	80,000,000	35,000,000	32,000,000	29,750,000	\$29,750,000
Grants to States		(76,000,000)	(28,262,500)	(76,000,000)	(33,250,000)	(30,400,000)	(28,262,500)	(28,262,500)
Grants for special projects		(4,000,000)	(1,487,500)	(4,000,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,487,500)	(1,487,500)
Planning and evaluation (ESEA Amendments of 1967-IV)	0	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	14,000,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
Total	1,668,213,000	3,249,059,274	1,475,993,000	3,612,054,470	1,553,855,000	1,558,327,000	1,525,876,000	1,415,393,000
Libraries and community services:								
Library services	40,073,000	80,000,000	40,709,000	96,000,000	44,000,000	42,000,000	40,709,000	23,203,000
Grants for public libraries (LSCA I)		(55,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(17,500,000)
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)		(10,000,000)	(2,281,000)	(12,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,281,000)	(2,281,000)
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)		(10,000,000)	(2,094,000)	(12,500,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(2,094,000)	(2,094,000)
Library services to physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,997,000	(5,000,000)	(1,334,000)	(6,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,334,000)	(1,334,000)
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)		60,000,000	9,185,000	70,000,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	9,185,000	0
College library resources (HEA II-A)	24,509,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	75,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	12,500,000
Acquisition and cataloging by Library of Congress (HEA II-C)	5,478,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	11,100,000	5,500,000	8,500,000	7,356,000	4,500,000
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	8,016,000	² 11,800,000	8,250,000	² 28,000,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	4,000,000
University community services (HEA-I)	9,755,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	50,000,000	14,000,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
Adult basic education	38,634,000	70,000,000	45,000,000	80,000,000	53,500,000	50,200,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Grants to States (Adult Education Act)			(36,000,000)		(42,800,000)	(40,160,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)
Special projects (Adult Education Act)			(7,000,000)		(8,200,000)	(8,040,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)
Teacher education (Adult Education Act)			(2,000,000)		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
Educational broadcasting facilities—grants for facilities (Title III, Communications Act of 1934)	0	12,500,000	4,000,000	15,000,000	13,625,000	8,625,000	5,625,000	4,000,000
Total	153,462,000	275,300,000	147,144,000	425,100,000	179,675,000	168,375,000	155,625,000	107,709,000

¹ Includes supervision which is funded under title V, ESEA.² Includes library research which is shown under "Research and training."

A NEW WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, man has ever sought to extend the dimensions of his world, to know more of his universe, perhaps so that he could better know himself.

Man walked to the edges of the world as he knew it, and then risked all to learn what lay across the perilous ocean depths. And having sailed the ocean and found a new world, man knew that there was yet another world beneath the sea.

Yesterday, man voyaged to the very surface of the moon, there to see and touch a barren, forbidding new world. At the same time, man drifted through the ocean depths, exploring the mysteries of a marine world equally as dangerous, equally as unknown, equally as challenging as the moon.

All of this is part of the eternal quest to learn, and perhaps to know the secrets of the universe.

Man has now again, as in the days of David, lived to know the truth of the Psalm:

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil.

I praise the courage of the astronauts, and all who venture to the edges of our world and universe, and I pray for their safe return. May their journey mark the beginning of a search not only for a new world, but begin for all mankind a search for peace on earth.

VIETNAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that President Nixon seeks by every honorable means to bring an end to the war in Vietnam. In his speech of May 14 he set forth specific proposals by which this war could be ended. Since then Saigon has offered the National Liberation Front the opportunity to participate in elections in which all the people of South Vietnam would have a voice. Symbolic of our good faith the President has withdrawn some of our combat troops.

There is no mistaking the willingness of the United States to make every reasonable concession that there may be meaningful negotiations for an honorable settlement of the war.

In these efforts the great majority of the American people support the President. But there should be no misunderstanding on the part of Hanoi that however earnestly the American people desire peace, they do not desire peace at any price. The cause of freedom means more to the American people than life itself. Hanoi must know that there is no intention on the part of this administration, nor is there any desire on the part of the American people, that we summarily surrender. To do so would mean that all our sacrifices have been in vain.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Republic of Vietnam have long sought ways and means to arrive

at a resolution of the conflict in that tormented country. There have been a number of major initiatives on the tortuous road to peace. One was the partial bombing halt over North Vietnam on March 31, 1968; another was the opening of discussion in Paris between the United States and North Vietnam in May of last year; a third was the total bombing halt of November 1, 1968, and the concurrent agreement on the expansion of the Paris meetings to include the Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. More recently, we have seen President Thieu's forthcoming offer to engage in private discussions, without preconditions, with the National Liberation Front. Subsequently, there was President Nixon's speech of May 14, in which he advanced serious and sweeping proposals for a settlement, and then his announcement that 25,000 U.S. troops would be replaced, not later than the end of August, by South Vietnamese.

Now, in Saigon on July 11, President Thieu has added to the basis for a reasonable settlement by proposing elections, in which the National Liberation Front would be allowed to participate; the creation of an electoral commission, on which the National Liberation Front would likewise be represented, to work out the timetable and the modalities; and the establishment of an international body to oversee the conduct of those elections. Most important of all, he has committed the Republic of Vietnam to abide by the outcome of those elections, whatever the outcome may be. And he has challenged the Vietnamese Communists to do likewise.

What have the Communists said and done in response? They have rejected President Thieu's offer and called it "deceitful." Why? We cannot know precisely, but we can guess that the Communists are afraid to put their political strength on the line, even when they would have a voice in organizing the electoral contest. What have they offered? Nothing more than the 10 points they tabled last May, in which they called for the establishment of a "provisional coalition government" in which, as their own description of it implies, they would have dominant influence without having to submit to any electoral process, and by means of which they would hope to set aside the present Government of Vietnam.

The time has come for the Vietnamese Communists to live up to the high-sounding phrases they have been uttering for years and years. If they really wish to see the people of South Vietnam determine their future free from outside interference, let the southerners among them sit down with representatives of the Republic of Vietnam at Paris and work out the details of the elections President Thieu has proposed. Let them abandon the tactics of violence, of terrorism, that have cost the lives of so many of their countrymen and engage instead in peaceful, electoral competition. Let their northern colleagues withdraw their troops from South Vietnam, as the United States has already begun to do, so that those elections can be carried out in a proper atmosphere.

Meanwhile, let us recognize the political courage of President Thieu, his government, and his people. Let us appreciate his statesmanlike and forthcoming proposals, which have demonstrated the good will of the Republic of Vietnam and which call for serious and considered response—not contemptuous dismissal—by the other side.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AS A SEEKER OF PEACE FOR ALL MANKIND

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the message which the astronauts took with them to the moon is a simple and powerful one: "We came in peace for all mankind." So the message of the President's forthcoming trip is also simple and powerful. He comes as a seeker of peace for all mankind.

Every one of the Asian capitals which President Nixon is visiting this month was on his itinerary 2 years ago when he traveled as a private citizen. Some of them he has visited as many as four or five times. He also visited Rumania when

he was out of office. He returns, therefore, as an old friend and well-informed student of all the countries he is visiting. His knowledge of these nations and his personal relationship with their leaders is an important personal resource for him and a tremendous national resource for all of us.

While the President is visiting the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, the Secretary of State will also go to the Philippines and Indonesia—and will then go on his own to Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, Australia, and New Zealand. So between them, our two leaders will visit 10 different Asian governments—seeking their views on important problems and emphasizing the commitment of this country to peace and progress for all people in the world.

Certainly Asia is a critical part of the world as far as this Nation is concerned. Most of our economic aid, our technical assistance, and our military aid programs have been directed there. Here American men have fought and died in three wars in the last three decades. Here live over one-half of the world's people. Here is where the potential for Communist growth seems to present the greatest danger.

In October of 1967, President Nixon wrote an article in Foreign Affairs magazine entitled "Asia After Vietnam." It was a thoughtful analysis of the need for Asians to find Asian solutions to their economic and political problems, to achieve their goals and defend their peoples through regional cooperation of a sort which would not require the direct kind of American involvement we have seen in the past. When he wrote this article, President Nixon was a private citizen, one who had traveled widely and thought deeply, but one who still could deal only in words and in suggestions.

Now as President of the United States, he is in a position to act on those thoughtful suggestions and to deal in deeds as well as in words. This trip to Asia represents one way in which he can advance that process.

I know he has the good wishes and the support of all Americans as he embarks on this important trip.

REFINING AMERICA—THROUGH THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—BY OUR OIL INDUSTRY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given to foreign and domestic depletion allowances enjoyed by the oil industry at expense of America's taxpaying public. For a certainty, they are a gaping pair of tax loopholes. Yet there is another method of tax evasion utilized by this industry which has escaped glaring public scrutiny. I refer to the foreign tax credit, by which American oil companies receive a dollar-per-dollar domestic tax writeoff and exemption for every dollar they pay in taxes or royalties abroad.

I submit that such tax credits should forthwith be terminated, on the grounds

that they are enabling American oil companies to evade paying Federal tax on upward of \$2 billion annually in this manner. No better tax reform could be initiated. I have just introduced a bill which would have the effect desired in this case.

It is understood among those conversant with the oil industry that a minimum of 80 to 85 percent of funds they list with the SEC as foreign and some States' taxes are paid out abroad. Some of these moneys are utilized in highly questionable ways, which I shall delve into at length in the future. I have communicated my information and results of my research to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this body. The text of the letter and results of the research are as follows:

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Knowing how intensively you and your committee are working on tax reform, I wish to bring to your attention another aspect of a massive escape of payment of taxes on the part of an entire industry. I refer, of course, to our oil industry. In this case I have specific reference to the foreign tax credit.

In 1968, as verified by the SEC, our oil industry paid \$1,981,126,000 in foreign and some state taxes. It is conservatively estimated that 80% of this sum is paid out as taxes to foreign governments. Thirteen of the largest corporations accounted for \$1,817,604,000 of this amount. Under existing law, this sum is treated as a foreign tax credit, and is immune from Federal tax laws. The oil companies receive a dollar-per-dollar tax credit for such foreign taxes.

It is my intention to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that credit for foreign taxes shall not be allowed in the case of taxes paid in any form to a foreign country in connection with production of oil and gas. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will see fit to consider this as an integral element of tax reform regarding the oil industry.

I see no reason why American oil and gas companies producing oil abroad should receive a dollar-per-dollar credit against their Federal income taxes, which is allowed them now. This is simply subsidization by our taxpayers of foreign investment, the tax benefits from which accrue to foreign countries.

My measure simply removes oil and gas companies from eligibility to receive foreign tax credits. While the present code does not specifically give them this tax privilege, they are clearly eligible.

I see no reason why American oil companies should be able to take a very profitable barrel of oil out of the ground overseas, and receive a tax write-off for that amount at expense of our taxpaying public. This is tax evasion with a vengeance. What the oil companies decide to pay slaveowning sheiks of the Middle East in royalties is their business. I do not think, however, we should continue to be forced to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, the list of oil industry privileges seems as endless as it is intolerable. We must add this loophole to their domestic and foreign depletion allowances, which are the highest for any extractive industry. I pray that we shall see an end to their outrages upon the public. I hope that in your eminently fair consideration of tax reform you will give serious consideration to eliminating this particular tax privilege. Thank you.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

TAXES PAID BY A SELECTED GROUP OF THE NATION'S LARGEST REFINING COMPANIES, 1968

[In thousands of dollars]

	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some states' tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard Oil (New Jersey).....	2,303,587	223,999	9.7	802,907	34.8	1,276,681
Gulf.....	977,321	8,005	.81	342,997	35.1	626,319
Texaco.....	1,019,930	23,800	2.4	160,600	15.8	835,530
Mobil.....	673,739	22,000	3.3	223,500	33.2	428,239
Standard Oil (California).....	569,431	16,700	2.9	100,900	17.7	451,813
Standard Oil (Indiana).....	395,064	74,678	18.8	10,892	2.7	309,494
Shell.....	387,767	63,378	16.3	12,298	3.2	312,091
Cities Service.....	138,613	12,683	9.2	4,594	3.3	121,336
Union.....	164,232	5,955	3.6	7,045	4.3	151,232
Sun.....	227,790	44,290	19.4	19,070	8.4	164,430
Atlantic-Richfield.....	240,272	2,999	1.2	37,713	15.7	199,560
Marathon.....	155,335	4,350	2.8	67,659	43.6	83,326
Sinclair.....	101,265	-2,747	0	27,429	27.0	76,583
Conoco.....	290,357	9,721	3.3	130,594	45.0	150,042
Phillips.....	184,560	32,584	17.7	15,174	8.2	136,802
Standard Oil (Ohio).....	113,571	38,100	33.5	5,394	4.7	70,077
Getty.....	112,798	6,712	6.0	7,836	6.9	98,250
Ashland.....	79,115	26,251	33.2	4,524	5.7	48,340
Total.....	8,134,717	613,458	7.7	1,980,586	24.3	5,540,163

TVA DOING OUTSTANDING JOB

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, watermilfoil has become a serious problem in some of the main stream reservoirs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Guntersville Lake, in my congressional district, has been severely hit by the rampant growth of this watermilfoil.

The people of Guntersville and the surrounding area realize the importance of Lake Guntersville to their economy. The Guntersville Chamber of Commerce has sent to me a resolution of appreciation for the outstanding job done by the Tennessee Valley Authority toward controlling this pest weed.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution in the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE GUNTERSVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
IN APPRECIATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY
AUTHORITY

Whereas, the people of Guntersville recognize the importance of Lake Guntersville as it pertains to our economy; and,

Whereas, the people of Guntersville abhorred the hazards to navigation in the surrounding waters imposed by the milfoil infestation; and,

Whereas, the destruction of the most beautiful recreational area in the south was assured by said infestation; and,

Whereas, the safety of the visitors to this area was being jeopardized;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the people of Guntersville, Alabama on this 15th day of July, 1969, that our everlasting appreciation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the outstanding job done towards controlling the infestation described herein, be conveyed, and that this resolution be made a public record by introducing it into the congressional records in our nation's capitol.

JOHN WILLIS,

President.

RICHARD FLEMING,
Executive Secretary.

HIGHWAY TO BE NAMED FOR
CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished colleague, the

Honorable BILL NICHOLS, is being honored for his outstanding work in the Alabama State Legislature by having a highway named for him. Congressman NICHOLS established a lasting record of achievement in Alabama by his diligent work for better highways to serve the people of our State, and is certainly deserving of this recognition.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this time an editorial which appeared recently in the Talladega Daily Home regarding the Bill Nichols Scenic Highway.

The editorial follows:

HIGHWAY TO BE NAMED FOR
CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS

SYLACAUGA.—Congressman Bill Nichols may not consider himself scenic but he has a highway named after him.

Legislation was officially completed in Montgomery Wednesday that would name Alabama 143, between Sylacauga and Miller-ville the "Bill Nichols Scenic Highway."

Representative Lyndol Bolton said members of the Legislative Delegation felt Nichols deserved to have the highway named for him.

"He worked long and hard for the highway. We felt it only appropriate that the highway should carry his name," Bolton said.

Eventually the southern tip of the long talked about, Skyline Drive, will connect with the highway.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT REORGANIZATION ACT OF
1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week we received the administration's proposed District of Columbia Court Reorganization Act of 1969. I support the general purpose and thrust of this legislation and have cosponsored the measures in the House. Because certain Members may have received false impressions of the legislation as a result of the prematurely public statements of the District of Columbia government on some of its provisions, I request permission to rebut those statements here.

According to newspaper accounts, on Wednesday, July 9, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, generally known as the Mayor, sent to the Bureau

of the Budget his comments on the District of Columbia Court Reorganization Act. The Commissioner's comments take the form of opposition to certain parts of the act on the ground that they are contradictory to, or in derogation of, the principle of home rule. The Commissioner wants to be able to appoint the judges, to run the prosecutor's office, to tamper with the court system budget, and to run the probation and social-work services of the courts. If anyone else does these things, he says, it is not home rule.

I would say that the Commissioner's failure to understand the true thrust of the act, and his misinterpretation of some of its provisions, are the best evidence I have seen that the District's infant government must learn to walk before it tries to run. The Commissioner apparently does not understand that principle.

Examine, for a moment, the matter of the court system's budget. Budget matters are generally dull and beyond most men's comprehension, but this particular matter is rather simple. The Commissioner opposes the provision in the act which would allow the District government to comment upon the court system's budget when it is submitted to the Congress, but not to alter it. He says that is contrary to home rule principles. He does not notice that the act places the same limitations on the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the District of Columbia court system budget estimates and requests.

In effect, the act would put the District's courts on the same footing as the Federal courts for budget purposes, by freeing their requests to the legislative branch from any tampering by the executive branch, local or Federal. The basic principle here is the independence of the judiciary in our system of government. If the Commissioner thinks that principle is contrary to home rule, he is welcome to his opinion, but I do not think it is a very well informed one.

Let us examine the other points made by the Commissioner in his letter.

He opposes the act's provision for appointment of District of Columbia court judges by the President. He says this should be done by himself, or by the President only on his recommendation. I know of no city in the country where the mayor appoints judges of a court of general, unlimited jurisdiction. I know of no State where the Governor makes such appointments only on the recommendation of a mayor. I certainly know of no State where the power to appoint judges is exercised by an appointed official, such as the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

Next, he objects to the fact that the act would continue the present system of prosecuting offenses in the District of Columbia, in which the U.S. attorney bears the brunt of the load, and the Corporation Counsel prosecutes minor statutory offenses and ordinance violations and acts as prosecutor in the juvenile court. He says this is contrary to home rule. Well, in most major cities of the country, the city's corporation counsel has the same, or even less, prosecutorial authority. and major criminal cases are

prosecuted by someone else. Usually it is a district attorney, a State's attorney or commonwealth attorney, or the State attorney general. The head prosecutor is either appointed by the Governor of the State or elected. He is separate from the local, municipal administration, because one of his functions is watching that local administration for corruption. You do not want the cat in bed with the mice. That is the basic principle. I think that, like judicial independence, it is a more important principle than home rule.

Parenthetically, I think that perhaps, in the not too distant future, this city may have an independent district attorney. If so, he should be appointed by the President.

Such a district attorney would take over the prosecutorial duties of the Corporation Counsel, as well as the local law-enforcement functions of the U.S. attorney. With the new court system put forward by this Court Reorganization Act, the assistant U.S. attorney in charge of the U.S. attorney's office will become a very important figure, and that division of the office may become so large, and so separate from the rest of the office, that it will make more sense to make it a completely separate office. That may be the case. I am not predicting, just speculating. If it happens, perhaps we ought to have a separate district attorney's office for the city of Washington. But the first step in that direction should be to beef up the U.S. attorney's operation in the superior court, not to give greater authority to the Corporation Counsel.

Indeed, I question whether the act goes far enough in that regard. Perhaps the Corporation Counsel ought to get out of the law-enforcement business entirely, and serve, like other city corporation counsels, solely as the civil attorney for the city. It certainly does not make great sense for one prosecutor to handle a case before the juvenile court, and for another to take it over if the juvenile court waives jurisdiction, as it is today. I understand the draftsmen of this act considered doing something like putting all prosecutions except violations of municipal ordinances in the hands of the U.S. attorney, but felt that it was inconsistent with home rule. As a single, immediate step, it might be inconsistent, but as a step toward the creation of a district attorney it would not. It would be taking one step sideways to take two steps forward.

But that is an issue for another day. I mention it only to refute the Commissioner's suggestion that the Corporation Counsel should prosecute all local offenses. The basic failing of that suggestion is that the Corporation Counsel is not ready to do it. He does not have any experienced assistants who are qualified to handle serious criminal cases. It is not that he does not have many good lawyers on his staff, but few of them are experienced in the trial of criminal cases, and those few are, generally, not out of the top drawer. He does not attract the same caliber of young lawyers as the U.S. attorney.

The Commissioner also questions a provision of this act which would make the witness fees in the new District of

Columbia Superior Court the same as those across the street in the U.S. district court. This also, he says, is contrary to home rule. It may be contrary to home rule, but it strikes me as nothing more than simple justice. Both sets of courts are created by Congress, and Congress should set the same fees for witnesses and jurors on both sides of the street. If anyone is to have the power to change those fees, other than the Congress, it should be the courts themselves, not the City Council as he suggests.

Again, this relates to the independence of the judiciary, which the Commissioner does not seem to understand. In the same vein is his criticism of the act's provision for expanding the local court system's social service operations and unifying those activities under a director of social services. The Commissioner feels that this office will duplicate the functions of the Department of Welfare, and that its operations should be placed under his office, with the power to appoint the director in his hands, rather than those of the courts and their executive officer. One may speculate whether the Commissioner's real objection is not to duplication of functions, but to the performance of those functions by persons not directly responsible to him.

In particular, he appears to have missed that provision of the act which requires the superior court's director of social services, "whenever possible" to "coordinate with and utilize the services of appropriate public and private agencies within the District of Columbia." The act explicitly tells the director to avoid the very duplication of effort which the Commissioner says it will create. One almost has to wonder whether he has read the act he is criticizing.

There are other comments in the Commissioner's letter which do not bear repetition here. I think it is fair to say that they are all in the same vein. This, or that, is inconsistent with home rule.

The Commissioner may be an able man in many respects, but in this instance he cannot see the forest for the trees. This act, in its broad general outlines, overall structure, purpose and thrust, increases the power of the District in its judicial branch to handle its own affairs.

I expect that many opponents and proponents of home rule will support this act. You need not be for or against home rule to support improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, which is the major purpose of this act. It accomplishes that purpose by upgrading and consolidating the local courts, and by giving to the local courts, for the first time, full jurisdiction over the trial of local matters. Not to do this would be enormously inconsistent with home rule, although this can, and should, be done without home rule, or without regard to whether we are to have home rule, or how much we are to have.

Commissioner Washington wants us to decide that question first, and to make the local courts of the District subservient to the executive and legislative branches of the local government. The Commissioner is putting the cart before the horse. We need not now resolve the

thorny problem of how to balance the local and Federal interest in the Nation's Capital. But we should, in both interests, in everyone's interest, pass this legislation for a unified, simplified court system for the Nation's Capital.

The most surprising thing of all, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this man criticized publicly a proposal of the President of the United States even before it had been formally presented to the Congress. He was reappointed by the President to ostensibly cooperate with the new administration in carrying out its proposals and programs for the Nation's Capital. By accepting the reappointment he agreed to be a member of the President's team. I believe it is almost without precedent for anyone appointed by the President of the United States to publicly criticize his proposals and remain on the job. Yet this practice in recent days by appointees to the District government has become the rule rather than the exception. His appointees to the City Council opposed his very first anticrime proposal, that of increasing the size of the Metropolitan Police Department.

This situation has become extremely serious, Mr. Speaker. Unless the President of the United States can get more loyalty and support from those he appoints to the District government in the future, the record of this administration insofar as the District is concerned can only be a miserable failure.

VIETNAM

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, we all know the importance of U.S. public opinion in the calculations of Hanoi.

There can be no doubt of the desire of the American people for peace; the record of our Government's steps to de-escalate the war, make every reasonable concession, and get on to real negotiations for peace is clear.

Communist political instructions often refer to U.S. public opinion as the "battlefront right in the United States" and they make no bones about their hopes for achieving a breakthrough on that front and thus increasing pressures on the administration. This creates a difficult predicament for honest critics of the war, because they know that their words might be used by Hanoi propaganda and thus could complicate the negotiating position of our own government.

What Hanoi must understand is that there are limits beyond which responsible critics in this country will not go.

When they see the administration put forward a comprehensive and generous series of proposals, as President Nixon did on May 14; when they see President Thieu offering to have secret talks with the NLF, as he did on March 25, and now offering the NLF a chance to compete as a group in elections and have a voice in deciding electoral procedures, as he did on July 11; and when we see the first combat troops actually coming home as a part of a general replacement process—then we ask what is the other side doing for peace?

When we see Hanoi and the NLF in

Paris constantly saying "No" to our proposals while they plan new attacks on the battlefields of South Vietnam, then we ask why does Hanoi still count on American public opinion to be critical of the Administration rather than critical of Hanoi?

It is time Hanoi understood that this country, in its great majority, supports the policies of the President and is losing patience with the short-sightedness of Hanoi.

Let all know that the United States earnestly desires peace, and that we will take every reasonable step to achieve it. But all should also know that this does not mean faintheartedness of fundamentals of freedom. In the performance of duty and in the cause of freedom, Americans are not driven from the field by fatigue or frustration, or demands to sacrifice.

This is the implicit message which members of this body and the public are now sending Hanoi, and it is a message which should be taken very seriously by the leaders of the Politbureau of North Vietnam.

It takes two to negotiate. We in this country are ready. Hanoi should now show it is also ready.

APOLLO AND WORLD PEACE

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the events of yesterday defy human imagination. To walk on the surface of the moon is an accomplishment which is truly "one giant leap for mankind."

Space exploration is a necessary element of national leadership which can become a powerful force for international friendship and cooperation. History teaches that those nations which selfishly turn their energies inward will become second-rate powers. Let us never forget this fact as we talk about the need for reassessing national priorities. Space is the new frontier which challenges the United States to seize and extend its technological leadership.

It is very true that space activities can act as a substitute for aggression, and observation satellites can also become major tools in arms control, disarmament, and inspection to insure that international agreements are honored.

When President John F. Kennedy came before this Congress on May 25, 1961, and boldly proclaimed the national goal of a manned lunar landing within this decade, his address was made against the backdrop of the serious competitive challenge posed by the Soviet Union. The orbiting of sputnik in 1957, followed by the manned orbital flight of Yuri Gagarin in 1961, spurred the United States to frenzied activity in what we all thought of as "the space race." It might now be possible to turn this competition into the kind of cooperative space endeavor which would be an important building block in the structure of international understanding.

THREATS AND INTIMIDATION BY UMW LEADERSHIP

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the threats, intimidation, and violations of both law and simple decency and fairness by the top leadership of the United Mine Workers of America continues and is compounded daily. On July 15, 1969, at page 19636 there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter to Secretary of Labor Shultz, dated July 9, 1969, detailing a number of apparent violations of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act—The Landrum-Griffin Act—perpetrated by the top leadership of the United Mine Workers of America.

Now there are even more acts by the same UMW leadership which apparently fears so much for its future that the top officers are afraid to allow the rank and file members of the United Mine Workers of America to vote as they please. These threats, these beatings, this intimidation, these goon-squad tactics to break up meetings, these uses of union dues to buy an election, these frenzied attempts to buy support for Mr. Boyle and his henchmen do not merely march up to the fringes of law violations—they seem to constitute direct thwarting of the law.

On two occasions, Mr. Boyle has already been found on the judicial record to be in violation of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act with respect to Mr. Boyle's attempts to block legitimate campaign efforts of Mr. Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for president of the United Mine Workers of America.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to additional evidences of what appear to be law violators, as detailed in a letter dated July 18, 1969, dispatched to Secretary of Labor Shultz by Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.:

RAUH AND SILARD,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On July 9, 1969, Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for President of the United Mine Workers of America, and H. Elmer Brown, candidate for Vice President thereof, requested an immediate and continuing investigation of the illegal activities of the incumbent UMWA officers who are seeking to prevent the nomination of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown for those offices. I am writing on behalf of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown once again to set forth additional pieces of information supporting our earlier request for an investigation. It can truthfully be said that there has never been the equal in massive violations of federal law to what the officers of the UMWA are now doing.

Initially, it should be pointed out that a copy of the July 9th letter was served the same day upon W. A. ("Tony") Boyle, President, George J. Titler, Vice President, and John Owens, Secretary-Treasurer, with a request that the union or its governing Board or officers bring suit to remedy the breaches of trust by the incumbent UMWA officers and those working with them as enumerated in the July 9th letter to you. That request was, in effect, rejected in a letter from Mr. Ed-

ward Carey, General Counsel of the UMWA, dated July 14, 1969, a copy of which was sent to you. But the significant thing about Mr. Carey's letter was not his rejection of our request; rather it was his calculated failure to deny practically every assertion in our letter to you, a denial which would have carried the penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001.

Incidentally, in the two instances where Mr. Carey did make statements of fact, they are without foundation. The suggestion in Mr. Carey's letter that Mr. Yablonski was somehow involved in the change of the UMWA Constitution in 1964 to require 50 nominations from local unions rather than 5 has no support in any record of the UMWA and is incorrect. The statement of fact—Mr. Carey's denial that "an attorney for the UMWA deliberately sought to sabotage the mailing"—falls in the face of the actual facts. After Judge Corcoran issued his preliminary injunction on June 20, 1969, directing the UMWA to send out Mr. Yablonski's campaign literature, lawyers for the UMWA and Mr. Yablonski worked out an arrangement under which a non-profit bulk mailing permit was obtained by the UMWA from the Silver Spring, Maryland, Post Office (Permit No. 542). It was understood that this permit was acquired for the purpose of distributing Mr. Yablonski's campaign literature pursuant to Judge Corcoran's Order. While Mr. Yablonski's literature, under the label "Miners for Yablonski," was on the printing press and after the postal authorities had approved use of said permit by Mr. Yablonski, Mr. Willard Owens, a lawyer for the UMWA and son of Secretary-Treasurer John Owens, called Mr. Harold E. McKnight, the relevant officials of the Post Office Department, and informed him that an organization of private individuals, i.e., "Miners for Yablonski," was attempting to use the UMWA non-profit bulk mailing permit. Mr. Owens further told Mr. McKnight that "Miners for Yablonski" was not the same entity as UMWA and that therefore he thought they should not be allowed to use the UMWA bulk mailing permit. He did not mention the fact that the UMWA were under federal injunction to mail out Mr. Yablonski's literature under their aegis nor that UMWA had obtained the non-profit bulk mailing permit for the express purpose of this very mailing. Only after this deception was uncovered by Mr. Yablonski's counsel was the matter rectified at the Post Office and the mailing consummated.

Mr. Carey's calculated failure to deal with the factual allegations in our letter of July 9, 1969, adds urgency to our request to the Labor Department for immediate action.

We desire, in addition, to submit certain further information corroborating the UMWA's course of illegal conduct, which has come to our attention since delivery of the earlier letter to you:

1. Referring to paragraph 2 of our July 9th letter, we can now report that Judge Corcoran again ruled for Mr. Yablonski on July 15, 1969 (Civil Action No. 1799-69), holding Mr. Boyle's removal of Mr. Yablonski from his office as acting director of Labor's Non-Partisan League to be an illegal reprisal against him for exercising rights under LMRDA and directing Mr. Yablonski's reinstatement. In other words, Mr. Boyle has now been found, on the judicial record, twice to have been in flagrant violation of LMRDA.

2. With respect to paragraph 3 of our earlier letter, Mr. Yablonski has not yet fully recovered from the blow knocking him unconscious at the campaign meeting on June 28, 1969. We understand that the Department of Justice is still investigating this violence against Mr. Yablonski.

3. With respect to paragraph 5 of the earlier letter, those working for Mr. Boyle have continued to approach and to direct supporters of Mr. Yablonski to switch to Mr. Boyle and have threatened later reprisal if they do not do so. Among those so approached, in addition to others already men-

tioned, are Charles Shawkey, a local union president at Boomer, West Virginia.

4. With respect to paragraphs 8 and 9 dealing with the discriminatory dechartering of local unions to avoid Yablonski-Brown nominations, that process continues unabated, UMWA Local 7488, Oakwood, Virginia, and its President, Tom Owens, strongly support Mr. Yablonski. In order to avoid a nomination of Mr. Yablonski, a paid official of trusted UMWA District 28 tried to force Local 7488 into a merger with a larger nearby local and, failing in that, literally snatched the official seal of the local and escaped therewith with local union members in hot pursuit. Although the official seal was recovered on a writ of replevin, the threat of discriminatory dechartering still looms.

5. With respect to paragraphs 10, 11, and 12 of the earlier letter, the pattern of surprise meetings and surprise nominations continues. On July 5, 1969, without any prior notice and even before the nominating period had officially commenced, the same violation of law occurred as in UMWA Local 7113. This time it was Local Union 9603, Ragland, West Virginia. Only approximately a dozen of the more than two hundred local union members were present at this July 5th meeting, no notice of nominations having been given. One "Rusty" Runyon, a recently appointed paid employee of trusted UMWA District 17, successfully sprung a surprise nomination for the Boyle team upon the local union meeting.

6. Next, on July 14, 1969, the same type of surprise nomination was perpetrated upon UMWA Local 5582, Frackville, Pennsylvania. There, again, and as in all these instances in violation of the UMWA Constitution, no notices were posted or appeared in local newspapers informing the local union members that nominations were to be held at this regularly scheduled local union meeting.

7. Next, on July 16, 1969, about thirty members attended the regularly scheduled meeting of UMWA Local Union 1686, St. Clair, Pennsylvania. Again no notice had been given that nominations would be conducted at this meeting; and again a surprise nomination for the Boyle ticket was sprung, this time by one William Martin, brother-in-law of John Reddington, a UMWA trustee District 25 Executive Board member, who was also present. Despite the surprise, the opposition to Mr. Boyle became obvious. An attempt to close nominations immediately after the nomination of the Boyle ticket failed. Thereupon, James DeAngelo nominated Mr. Yablonski. In view of the threatening presence of paid District officials working for Mr. Boyle, Mr. DeAngelo demanded that the vote on nominations be by secret ballot. Reddington, in effect taking over the meeting, prevented the secret ballot; instead a voice vote was announced in favor of the Boyle ticket though no count whatever was taken.

8. An equal, if not more flagrant, violation of LMRDA occurred the same day at the regularly scheduled meeting of UMWA Local Union 807, Shenandoah, Pennsylvania. The president of that local, one John Karlavage, is also a paid official of UMWA trustee District 25 and was the leading instigator of the disruption of the campaign rally in Shenandoah referred to in paragraph 4 of our earlier letter. No notice was given that this regularly scheduled meeting would consider nominations. Compounding the absence of notice of nominations, Mr. Karlavage got a few people together in the meeting room and nominated the Boyle team even before the time of the regularly scheduled meeting and after a number of members, who had come in to pay their dues, left before the meeting opened because they were not informed that nominations would occur.

9. Mr. Karlavage was equally active the day before, i.e., on July 15, 1969, at UMWA Local 1516, Shenandoah, Pennsylvania. There, the only notices posted were at remote job sites long since abandoned by the mining

industry. Approximately twelve members attended this meeting, which nevertheless unanimously nominated Mr. Yablonski. However, Mr. Karlavage, the paid official of UMWA District 25 referred to in the previous paragraph; and other District officials, lingered behind after the meeting of Local 1516 and attempted to prevent the nomination going forward in due course.

10. With respect to paragraph 13 of the earlier letter, UMWA funds are continuing to be expended to prevent Yablonski-Brown nominations at an ever-accelerating pace. On July 13, 1969, incumbent UMWA officers Boyle, Titler, and Owens and their associates staged a "health and safety" rally at Welch, West Virginia. This rally, run at UMWA expense, was not the usual "health and safety" meeting; it was an out-and-out Boyle team election rally. Chartered buses, providing free transportation to the meeting, displayed large signs and placards (some professionally made) urging support of the Boyle ticket. Justin McCarthy, editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, utilized his office to arrange local radio and other advertising for the rally. Campaign literature urging reelection of the Boyle team was widely distributed at the rally. Eight of the rally's eleven organizers were appointed officials of trusted UMWA District 29.

11. With respect to paragraph 14 of the earlier letter, the anonymous and libelous sheet about Mr. Yablonski, prepared by Mr. McCarthy, has continued to be circulated by those working with Mr. Boyle. It is highly significant that Mr. McCarthy has not, under oath or otherwise, denied the charge made to the Secretary of Labor in the earlier letter that, in direct breach of trust, he wrote this anonymous and libelous sheet.

12. With respect to paragraph 15 of the earlier letter, the United Mine Workers Journal of July 15, 1969, is a most obvious campaign document for Mr. Boyle. His name appears favorably 34 times in 24 pages; statements such as these stand out:

"It would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that Lewis and his union saved the coal industry as we know it today. Only the solid rock of the joint wage agreement kept the price structure from being totally wrecked by cut-throat operators and for years on end it was the only stable element in a strife-torn business . . .

"In his last days, men challenging the present leadership of the union called upon him to 'save' it. There is no evidence that he ever deigned to acknowledge such a demand from crusader Ralph Nader, which will come as no surprise to those who know that Lewis groomed Tony Boyle as his eventual successor and heir" (p. 13).

Also:

"Ghizzoni [International Executive Board Member] warned his audience to beware of certain 'crackpots' who would destroy the effective leadership of the United Mine Workers of America. He drew a warm round of applause when he said the miners' slogan was 'Stick and Stay With Tony Boyle all the way.'"

Still no single mention of Mr. Yablonski.

13. With respect to paragraph 16 of the earlier letter, it is understood that the FBI has already received statements from several UMWA employees who were forced to assist in the conversion of union funds into Mr. Boyle's election campaign chest.

14. With respect to paragraph 17 of the earlier letter, the Boyle team continues to utilize the list of officers of local unions and continues to refuse to turn over the same list to Mr. Yablonski for like utilization.

15. But even all this is not the end. Local union presidents of pensioner locals in Southern Illinois are being offered \$150-\$200 each to coerce their locals into nominating incumbent Boyle and to block nominations for the Yablonski-Brown ticket.

16. The direct purchase of votes is also a Boyle team tactic. One James Manfredi, working for Mr. Boyle, offered to pay \$5 a vote

for Boyle at a nomination election of Local Union, 688 Fredericktown, Pennsylvania.

17. Paid officials of trusted UMWA District 17 were present at campaign rallies of Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown held in Matewan and Beckley, West Virginia, on Sunday, July 13, 1969. These officials, armed with tape recorders, compiled lists of Yablonski-Brown supporters attending the rallies, informed certain of them that the fact of their presence at the Yablonski-Brown rally was known and would be taken into consideration by District and International officials, and otherwise made clear that reprisal and intimidation would be meted out to persons attending Yablonski-Brown functions.

The case made against the incumbent officers of the United Mine Workers is so overwhelming that it seems hard to believe that there can be any question about the Department of Labor making the investigation for which Mr. Yablonski and Mr. Brown are asking. Now, nine days into the 30-day nominating period, we repeat that request even more urgently than in our earlier letter.

We make one additional request about which there also should be no question. We ask you to send our letter of July 9, 1969, and this letter to Mr. Boyle and request an official response to the charges made therein. The UMWA officials have been very careful not to deny to the Department of Labor the charges made in our original letter; rather Mr. Carey has merely sent you a copy of his letter to the undersigned which avoids answering the charges. We do not believe the Boyle team will submit a direct answer to the Department either under oath or under the penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001.

The Department has two ways to test out our allegations—by its own investigation and by its demand for a responsive statement from the UMWA. To make the LMRDA a reality rather than a formality we ask the Secretary to do both—now.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,

Attorney for: Joseph A. Yablonski, H. Elmer Brown.

ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the words that Astronaut Neil Armstrong spoke as he set foot on the moon last night will be remembered as long as man survives:

One small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.

Yesterday's moon landing ranks as the greatest scientific achievement—and the greatest adventure—in the history of mankind. Just after 4:14 p.m., yesterday, the unwieldy-looking lunar excursion module fluttered down to the surface of the moon, realizing a goal that took a near decade of work and all the technological resources of this Nation. The touchdown, an event that would have been considered the most bizarre science fiction in my youth, stirred literally hundreds of millions of people in just about every part of the globe. It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the whole world was watching when Astronaut Armstrong, his body ensheathed in a spacesuit that looked as if it had come straight out of a Buck Rogers comic strip, lumbered down the Lem's descent ladder and placed his foot on the moon.

What amounts to a fantastic dream—a dream that has diverted men for thousands of years—was realized at that mo-

ment. It is still hard to believe that last night we watched Armstrong and "Buzz" Aldrin striding about in their ungainly spacesuits on the moon's surface, alternating the most sober scientific work with playful gamboling before the TV camera. The courage of these two men—and what the younger generations would call their "cool"—cannot be overemphasized.

Their achievement's lasting significance for mankind, of course, will be left to future historians. But I think a few tentative judgments can be offered now. The lunar exploration, for one thing, signals the true opening of the space age. It opens up entire new frontiers—frontiers in science, in exploration, in technology, in man's continuing quest to understand himself and his universe. Just the few handfuls of rock that Apollo 11 will return to the earth may tell us more about the evolution of the solar system than any other clues that science has uncovered to date.

Still another immediate benefit stems from the lunar mission—a benefit that may be remembered as the most significant of all. Apollo 11 demonstrates what astonishing feats man is capable of once he sets a goal and works ardently to achieve it. It demonstrates that this country's most nettlesome problems—racial strife, urban decay, crime, injustice—can be solved.

President Nixon, in his telephone message to the astronauts last night, expressed hope that the lunar landing will inspire us to come up with solutions to the problems I have just cited. The text of the President's message follows:

Hello Neil and Buzz. I'm talking to you by telephone from the oval room at the White House. And this certainly has to be the most historic telephone call ever made.

I just can't tell you how proud we all are of what you have done. For every American, this has to be the proudest day of our lives and for people all over the world I am sure they too join with Americans in recognizing what an immense feat this is.

Because of what you have done the heavens have become a part of man's world. And as you talk to us from the Sea of Tranquility it inspires us to redouble our efforts to bring peace and tranquility to earth. For one priceless moment in the whole history of man all the people on this earth are truly one. One in their pride in what you have done and one in our prayers that you will return safely to earth.

The moon program, starting from scratch just 8 years ago, overcame technical barriers science once considered insuperable. It took the work of literally hundreds of thousands of people in Government, in colleges and universities, in private institutions, in industry. As a ranking member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development and Independent Offices—the legislative body that handles the NASA budget—I am proud to have had a role in helping achieve the goals of the space program. After President Kennedy announced the national goal of putting a man on the moon by the end of the decade, I helped lead the struggle to fund the space program adequately. I will continue to do so. One of the greatest honors of my life is NASA's decision to inscribe my name, along with the names of certain other Congressmen and world leaders, on a sil-

icon disc the Apollo 11 astronauts placed on the moon.

I am sure my colleagues join me, Mr. Speaker, in wishing Neil Armstrong, "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins a safe journey back to earth.

Our prayers are with them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. JOELSON), for Monday, July 21, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. MOLOHAN), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of influenza illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. DENNIS), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 11363.

Mr. BENNETT to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 11363.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. KEITH in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. MIZELL.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. GUDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. DINGELL in four instances.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
Mr. RIVERS in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. MIKVA in two instances.
Mr. VIGORITO.
Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.
Mr. DULSKI in three instances.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. Celler in two instances.
Mr. FRASER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

979. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Carroll, Chariton, Lafayette, and Saline Counties, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

980. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the settlement of claims of civilian personnel during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 241; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 17, 1969, the following bills were reported on July 18 and 19, 1969:

Mr. GARMATZ; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11363. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ; Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12549. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-378, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 21, 1969]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS; Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12829. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York; Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12964. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State,

Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 12964. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SISK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 12965. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12966. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12967. A bill to amend section 101(a) (27) (D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12968. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COWGER, Mr. McKNEALY, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. KEITH):

H.R. 12969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs, and to provide training and employment opportunities for those individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, by means of subsidies to employers engaged in small business on a decreasing scale in order to compensate such employers for the risk of hiring the poor and unskilled in their local communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 12970. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include prescribed drugs among the items and services covered under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12971. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12972. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12973. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12974. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and to transfer to such Department certain programs and functions currently being carried out by other Federal departments and

agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12975. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12976. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide extra compensation for officially ordered or approved time worked by postal field service employees, on any day designated by Executive order as a national day of mourning, holiday, or day of participation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12977. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 12978. A bill to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. WHITE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. LUKENS):

H.R. 12979. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise, clarify, and extend the provisions relating to court leave for employees of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 12980. A bill to provide a code of ethics for Federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, by amending chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 12981. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second- and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, to prescribe criminal penalties for such systematic use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12982. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12983. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 12984. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 12985. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 12986. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by strengthening and improving consumer protection under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to fish and fishery products, including provision for

assistance to, and cooperation with the States in the administration of their related programs and assistance by them in the carrying out of the Federal program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 12987. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12988. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim "Moon Day" and providing for the striking of medals and for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Apollo 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 825. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 826. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.J. Res. 827. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a national holiday commemorating man's landing on the moon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 487. Resolution expressing the commendation and gratitude of the House to the men and women of the national space program on the occasion of the Apollo 11 mission; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

244. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to revising the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

245. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to research into the habits of fish and the effects of a changing environment on fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12989. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Mahady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 12990. A bill for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12991. A bill for the relief of the estate of Junichi Taketa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12992. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Micco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

181. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to na-

tional defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

182. Also, petition of the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors, Atlanta, Ga.,

relative to Federal revenue sharing, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOOTPRINTS ON THE MOON

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, if it is proving difficult for most of us to "come down to earth" today, there is good reason—for we have just witnessed one of the most fantastic technical and scientific accomplishments of mankind's long history.

Fantastic, amazing, unbelievable—yes, all such adjectives and more of wonder, admiration, and common pride in man's indomitable spirit apply on this "day of participation" which, though formally declared only for Americans, is undoubtedly being experienced by all the people of this globe whose rulers have permitted them to know of Neil Armstrong's "small step" to the surface of the moon.

As we now wait for the safe return to earth of the first men on the moon, each of us is attempting after his own fashion to assess and understand the meaning of this tremendous adventure. Should we have attempted it? Was it worth it? Where, in space, should we go from here?

It does little good now, really, to ask if we should have attempted it—for we did, the money has been spent and, thus far, well spent if success be the yardstick.

Was it worth it? Well, who can really say?

Our Puritan heritage demands "good reason" for nearly everything we do—especially when public moneys are involved. Was this "giant leap for mankind" necessary from the standpoint of national prestige? Probably not, but yet surely our Nation's prestige is higher this day in nearly every corner of the earth than it has been. And that is good; good in terms of international good will, no matter how fleeting that change of mood toward us on the part of other people may be. Especially good for us, too, for our own confidence in ourselves has been badly shaken for many months, now. As *Life* magazine sought, editorially, to put all this in perspective some weeks back:

It is jarring to consider what might be our national mood today if Russia were on the moon and our international contribution were the war in Vietnam.

So there is that.

But was the trip necessary to beat the Russians to the moon? Again, probably not, though the fact remains that we did. And there is a sort of lift to our national spirit from that fact. Besides which there is a more important consideration in all this—in the possibility that international competition of this sort—as in economic, athletic, or cultural contests—provide the challenge that is inherent in feelings of nationalism with an

outlet that, all too often heretofore, only war has seemed to offer.

And so there has been that.

Was Apollo 11's trip necessary in order to help resolve the mysteries of the cosmos? Well, such a question provokes all kinds of answers. As *Life* also noted, man's curiosity and adventurous spirit has always seemed insatiable, adding:

Americans in particular have needed a quest, across the mountains or the continent, into the sky and sea, to the poles or inside the atom.

So it was probably inevitable that we would, some day, toss our hat over the "space wall," as the last President Kennedy said so we could "then explore the wonders on the other side."

From the material standpoint, it is questionable what we will find of value on the moon, or farther out in mysterious space. Perhaps, at best, we will find some keys to help us unlock some of the remaining secrets of our universe—how it was formed, if not why—and even though we may find no new sources of taxation, one supposes that just pushing back the boundaries of knowledge is something that bears no price tag.

So, again, there is that.

To which, Mr. Speaker, there already have been a whole host of valuable technical "spin-offs" with domestic applications from the space effort—and surely will be more of the same yet to come; a more practical justification for what we have done if neither knowledge nor the sheer exhilaration of high adventure is enough.

Of course, there are those who say that our own problems here on earth—and here at home—are such, and of such urgency, that we might better have concentrated thereon instead. This is a difficult argument to counter, even though *Life* once again remarked on the "acute human misery" prevailing in Spain when Columbus voyaged the Queen's money for his historic voyage, saying further:

It is possibly one of the greatest tragedies of our time that the eradication of ghettos and the cleansing of the air and the water or the cure for cancer do not offer quite the same stimulation (as space exploration).

And that is something we might well ponder, today, in the hope—that I, for one, would consider a promising one—that out of this lift in national spirit we all now have experienced, and out of our revived sense of community, could come both a new confidence and a new sense of resolution toward our more mundane, earthbound problems.

If, Mr. Speaker, this should prove to be possible, the cost of Apollo 11 would have been well worthwhile.

Thus there is possibly that.

But as I review my own thoughts while watching Neil Armstrong and "Buzz" Aldrin—wonder of wonders—making those historic footprints on the moon's surface, footprints that will stay there for centuries in the Sea of Tranquility alongside an American flag that

can no more feel or know the gales of earth than it can the invisible solar wind, it seems to me that the greatest of all possible dividends the Apollo 11 investment could pay would be in terms of an enhanced sense of world brotherhood.

For despite the flag and all the overtones of national glory and prestige, this was an adventure in which all mankind participated. The reactions from nearly everywhere abroad today prove that—giving emphasis once more to the human need to recognize the fact that we are, after all is said and done, truly "riders on the earth together."

Among the variety of messages left in that tiny silicon disk on the lunar surface by our astronauts was this one from President Tito, of Yugoslavia:

May this majestic fulfillment of the ancient dream of the human race . . . bring closer the realization of humanity's age-long vision to live in peace, brotherhood and joint endeavor.

And perhaps that—or something like it—is Apollo 11's real message.

If it is—and as we begin to decide where next to go in space—let us also remember that America's ability to help move this world of ours toward peace and brotherhood depends on more than power and prestige. If, as President Kennedy said, we cannot afford to be second best in space, neither can we afford to be second best in the effort to move that world from "an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation." Nor second best in the endeavor to improve the quality of our own civilization, on the basis of which rather than on feats in outer space we will be judged. Nor second best in our ideals—and our guiding philosophy—on which matters, too, and our devotion thereto, we shall also be judged.

Therefore, even as this is a day for self-congratulation, so is it, too, a day for re-dedication—for the full American dream has yet to be realized.

ROUTE TO MOON LIES THROUGH TENNESSEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the scheduled launching of the Apollo 11 moon mission nears, it is appropriate to point out that the testing for the huge Saturn rocket motors was carried out at Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

In this connection I place in the *Record* herewith my recent newsletter Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important scientific project.